

Digitized by the Internet Archive  
in 2024



*Theol. Seminary, Bangor*

225.61  
H872h  
1836

HUG'S

1837.

# INTRODUCTION

TO

# THE NEW TESTAMENT

TRANSLATED FROM THE THIRD GERMAN EDITION

BY

DAVID FOSDICK JR.

WITH

## NOTES

BY M. STUART,

Prof. Sacred Lit. in the Theol. Sem. Andover.

---

ANDOVER:

PRINTED AND PUBLISHED BY GOULD AND NEWMAN.

1836.

THE MASTER'S COLLEGE LIBRARY

SANTA CLARITA, CA 91321



Entered according to Act of Congress, in the year 1836, by  
GOULD AND NEWMAN,  
in the Clerk's office of the District Court of Massachusetts.

## PREFACE

BY THE TRANSLATOR.

---

THOSE who are acquainted with the merits of Hug's Introduction to the New Testament, will not think it strange that it should be deemed worthy of an English dress. It has long been in high repute in Germany, and among German scholars in other countries. As an index to the estimate put upon it in Germany, we may take the declaration of Gesenius (Bibl. Essays Art. I.) made with direct reference to this work: "He [Hug] excels all his predecessors in deep and fundamental investigations."

It is probably known to most who will read this preface, that an English translation of this work has already been published, (London, 1827, 2 vols. 8vo.), which was made by the *Rev. Daniel Guilford Wait, LL. D.* On examination this was found to be very imperfect, as it not only misses oftentimes, but occasionally reverses, the sense of the original. It exhibits, moreover, not only such a deficiency of acquaintance with the German language as is culpable in any one who undertakes to translate such a work, but also a want of practice, or at least of skill, even in English composition.

Some of the mistranslations are such as appear to be absolutely ludicrous. Two or three instances may suffice to justify this assertion. For the first, see p. 312 Vol. I. of the translation. In the third note, Hug intended to say that a certain edition of the New Testament was to be found in the Library of the University with which he was connected. To this end he uses the simple German demonstrative pronoun *hiesigen* (*this*, or *this here*.) Dr. Wait makes *hiesigen*, however, a proper name, and translates it by *Hessian*! Thus, instead of "the library of the University *in this place*," we have "the academical library of *Hessia*!"

On p. 318 of the same volume, we find a ludicrous, though intended as a grave, note by the translator, respecting the sense of the expression "jener armen Sünder," *those poor sinners*, somewhat humorously employed by Hug. The note of Dr. Wait is as follows: "Not being provided with a copy of this edition, I am uncertain whether by this term Hug means *convicts under sentence of death* (!) or simply "those poor sinners." It would puzzle any one to tell how the former sense could possibly have entered any man's mind.

On p. 484 of the same volume, Wait translates "*Kleinseite*,"



(the name by which one division of the city of Prague is designated, meaning, *Little Prague*,) *the weak side!*

It is unnecessary to multiply such instances. A perusal of the English, even without reference to the German, would satisfy every person competent to judge, that the translation is very defective. Another has therefore been deemed expedient.

It should be noticed, moreover, that Wait's version was made from the *second* German edition; while the present has been made from the *third*, to which many important additions were made by the author.

In translating, I have looked, or striven to look, more at the *sense* than the *phraseology* of the writer; believing that the rule of Horace is as suitable in this case, as in the case to which he originally applied it: "*Nec verbum verbo curabis reddere, fidus interpres.*" (Hor. Ars Poet. l. 133.) I would fain hope that the present translation is more correct than the one already published; though doubtless severe scrutiny, or even a cursory reading, might discover in it many imperfections. It is due to truth that I should acknowledge myself far from being satisfied with the manner in which I have executed my task. It has been performed under some disadvantages. Those, however, who are best acquainted with the difficulty of translating German into English, and also with the involved sentences and faulty style of composition to be found in Hug, will not be forward to denounce the defects which the version exhibits. Many pages might be devoted to the statement and exemplification of the faults of style in the original; but it would be out of place to do this here. Suffice it to say, that in general what is obscure in the translation is as much or more so in the original.

I have corrected almost innumerable mistakes in the references, numbers, &c. Many of them, it is probable, were only typographical errors. I fear that careful scrutiny may discover some new errors in the translation.

It is certainly singular that Hug should have neglected to affix the *accents* to the Greek so plentifully introduced into his work. The task of adding them has been no slight one; as, in common with most of my countrymen who have studied the Greek language, I was very little versed in the somewhat intricate theory of Greek accentuation. The first few sheets will be found more imperfect, in this respect, than the later ones.

In conclusion, it may not be improper for me to say, that had I been at first fully aware of the difficulty of the task to be accomplished in the translation and publication of this work, I should have undertaken it, if at all, with far less alacrity and more circumspection, and prosecuted it with more deliberate and considerate examination than I have actually practised.



## PREFATORY REMARKS

BY M. STUART.

THE remarks which Mr. Fosdick has made upon the difficulties of Hug's style, seem to me very just. After being somewhat conversant with German for a quarter of a century, Hug obliges me often to reperuse some of his sentences, more than once too, before I am satisfied that I understand them; and even then, there are some of them in respect to which I do not feel certain that I have discovered the meaning of the writer.

It is difficult to characterize that in the author which occasions this obscurity. There is not only a negligence as to the essential parts and relative positions of the proper ingredients of a perspicuous sentence, but (what I must call) an affectation of singularity, a peculiarity in modes of thought and expression. This, however, may belong to the mental characteristics of the author, rather than to his affectation; but if it is so, it does not diminish the difficulties in the way of a translator. No wonder that Dr. Wait, with his mite of German knowledge, could succeed no better. The translation of Hug is a task "*altius expeditis*."

I have not compared the body of Mr. Fosdick's version with the original; for this has been out of my power, and would have been little if any less labour than to translate the whole. But I have here and there compared parts of his translation with the German original, and found them to answer the just and reasonable expectations of the reader. That he has expended much severe labour on the work, there can be no doubt. That the version is sufficiently true and faithful to answer all the important purposes of a version, is clear to my mind. I have had a good opportunity to know this; inasmuch as I have read, or rather studied, the book throughout in its English dress, in order to prepare for writing the Notes contained in the Appendix.

It is not important for me to say much, if any thing, in this place, with regard to the manner in which Hug has executed this work, and the relative value of the work itself. My notes will disclose to the reader, how far I agree or disagree with him, in respect to most of his important positions. His mode of arguing and illustrating is often original and peculiar. It is not the more attractive to me, however, on this account. He does not say even the most common things, in the way that others say them; whether from affectation, or peculiarity of mind, I know not. Yet there is not so

much of this as ought to offend the reader, or to give him a distaste for the work. But in my humble opinion, when *perspicuity* in any writer is sacrificed, all other gain that is made by such a sacrifice can be no adequate compensation for this loss.

Hug now and then proposes some singular theories; in some cases I should even venture upon calling them *conceits*. But these are not frequent; and not many German writers of the present day will be found, who are men of genius, that do not abound in these more than Hug.

The *recent* literature respecting the New Testament, which he professes in his preface to have regarded and examined, has been but very sparingly examined by him, to say the least. And since the appearance of his *third* edition, there has been a great deal written which is more valuable than most that is to be found in the older literature. Every year is making some advances in the noble science of *sacred literature*. My notes will furnish the reader with references, which will aid him to extend his investigations beyond the pale of criticism as marked out by Hug. To have canvassed all the positions of Hug, would have demanded a book as large as his own; which would be inconsistent with the design of the work and the plan of the publishers. But whenever I have thought there was any important error or defect in the author, I have endeavoured to point it out, and briefly to give my reasons why I deemed it to be an error or defect. This is all that the Notes could promise or accomplish, unless the entire plan of the publication had been changed; which I did not think best.

The reader will be desirous to know something of Hug, in respect to his *religious* developments. He must know, then, that Hug is a Roman Catholic with a kind of Protestant heart. He wears, rather impatiently, if I discern aright, the chains which his profession imposes upon him; and when he comes to *critical* conclusions which he apprehends may be construed as being included under the banns of Mother-Church, he endeavours to make a separation between his *critical* and his *Catholic* conscience. His critical conscience is at liberty, while his Catholic conscience is permitted to go along with the multitude. This awkward predicament gives birth to some curious paragraphs in his book.

In respect to the great question between believers in a *divine* revelation and *neologists*, Hug seems, in the preface to his third edition, to have taken decisive ground; at least his language is certainly designed to wear this appearance. Speaking of the many discussions that have lately taken place in regard to the New Testament, and of the many attacks made upon the genuineness and authenticity of these writings, he uses the following language, in his preface:

“The contests between the Naturalists and the Supernaturalists



have constituted an important part of the recent disputes. The first have made pure Theism their aim ; and acknowledge nothing as appropriate in the way of investigation respecting morals and theology, excepting a *philosophy*, into which the common people can never make any deep researches. This last class of men need the *positive* in religion, and always will need it. This is given to them in a manner so noble, so perfect, so intelligible, that the simpleton becomes as good and virtuous, or even more so than the most learned, and more so than learning can make them. Why should we substitute, then, the commands of philosophy for those of the God of heaven ?

“ They [the Naturalists] think, perhaps, that they have outgrown the other or old School. Bravo ! Yet, if this be the case, they must be uncommon men, whom the common citizen of the town or country has neither preparation nor leisure nor capacity to imitate. The mass of men the Naturalists cannot even hope to reach in their instructions ; and all which they could achieve, if they did, would be to occasion to them the loss of what they already possess. The good which philosophical investigation and self-instruction proffer, the commonalty are not able to acquire.

“ The efforts of the Naturalists must be limited to the more learned class of men, so far as they are concerned with opposition to Supernaturalism. If, however, there is many a man, who, in all the efforts of philosophy past or prospective, in the ebb and flow of sinking and falling systems, finds no sure place to set down his foot, and who yet obtains quietude in a belief of the scriptural books which speak to his heart in so friendly a manner, and kindle in him desires after all that is beautiful and good ; why should any one strive to tear from him that to which he holds fast amid the waves of fluctuating opinions, and to substitute that in its place in which he has no confidence ? The greatest philosopher can be no more than a virtuous man ; what illiberality, then, in forbidding one to travel in any reputable road, except that of Rationalism !

“ They separate Religion and Morals, because the Greeks and Romans did so. But without any reason. Christianity in its very nature is *practical* ; and pure virtue, in its perfect state, is the Christian religion. All the doctrines which respect God, a future state, etc., tend only to produce a virtuous life ; which is the highest end of man.

“ The edifice of Christianity was built in a few years by using the scaffolding of Supernaturalism, and was in a short time filled with many inmates from different countries. But if Christianity had been only a school of philosophy, instructing and arguing on the grounds of mere reason, it would have attracted but a narrow circle of inquirers, like other schools, e. g. the Academy, and the Porch, and the Peripaton, and would never have been a *popular* Institute.



“To operate quickly on the mass of men, there was but one means, and that was Supernaturalism. The *divine* authority of the instruction communicated was declared by this, and was raised above doubts, and proclaimed as the highest rule for all men, for the unwise and even children; and by this these were placed in a condition, as to living and acting, like that of the wisest. I may well ask: If a thousand Professors of Rationalism were sent out into all the world, by means of rationalist schools and instructions to make men in general become moral, and to establish them in a virtuous life, will they venture to say, that they could have accomplished it?”

These remarks are certainly very pointed, and withal go very deep into the subject. The appeal is ultimate. By its *fruits* Rationalism is to be known and tried; has it produced, can it produce, much good fruit?

The older work of Michaelis on the literature of the N. Test., as translated by Marsh and accompanied by his Notes, has much in it that is useful. Mr. Horne's recent work has also many useful things, and exhibits great industry and pains on his part. But the work of Hug is more compressed in its manner, and more regular in its structure. On the whole, it would be difficult to select any one *Introduction* to the N. Test., which comprises more important and valuable matter that would be likely to prove attractive to the reader. I indulge the hope, that those who have laboured to bring this work before the public in an acceptable form, among whom its enterprising publishers are to be reckoned, have not laboured in vain.

Andover Theol. Sem.  
April 12, 1836.

# INTRODUCTION

TO THE

SCRIPTURES OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.

---

## PART I.

### CHAP. I.

AGE AND GENUINENESS OF THESE WRITINGS.

#### § 1. *Importance of these books in general.*

ALL the larger nations, of which we have any account, possessed or still possess systems of positive religion. These merely comprise certain directions how to live at peace with the gods, by means of sacrifices, presents and other tokens of service; or, in later times and cultivated states, enjoin the practice of social and personal virtues. So will it ever be, unless we idly attempt to urge men forward to a point which, as a body, they can never reach. It is a vain idea to expect, in future times, nations of absolute philosophers and communities of men like Socrates.<sup>1</sup>

The cares of life which press upon a large portion of our race, will never cease to require for themselves the time necessary for such investigations and conclusions. Besides, what is to guide each of us in the interim before we should be furnished with a stock of wisdom? What to become of him who cannot at any rate keep pace with his more gifted brother? What is to guide the young human being before he attains the capacity of self direction? Do you say the *authority* of parents and fellow-citizens? Very well: but let then an authority more worthy of reliance, more general, more consistent and more sacred than any other, be extended over them at birth; one which governs even the morals and principles of parents and citizens.

The obligations of civil life are not more difficult of discovery than those of pure morality; yet we despair of ever seeing nations, without

---

<sup>1</sup> Plato, De Republ. L. vi. p. 89 has already remarked this: φιλόσοφον . . . τὸ πλῆθος ἀδύνατον εἶναι.

positive laws, solely by dint of their own sagacity, deduce their civil obligations from the principles upon which they rest, and enter on their faithful performance. For the same reason that the code of civil law among nations is positive, must the code of morals be so too; for both alike aim at the direction of mankind and their actions.

The ancients did not discriminate so accurately. The time had not come to distinguish things which were lawful from things which were virtuous. For the first step, much was gained by discovering the former and coming to an agreement concerning them; but the latter were still undefined, the portion of rare and noble souls. Hence men were content with rendering hallowed the requisitions of the laws by means of the gods, and religion became a part of the civil ordinances of the state.

He who first isolated man, abstracted him from place, people, and country, and from all extrinsic influence, was in the way of discovering a law of the heart which is sacred to all beings of our race wherever they may be. Such a religion cannot but be true; since, disregarding adventitious circumstances, it constitutes an universal rule which tends to ennoble the nature of all intelligent creatures.

Happy the nations who possess such a religion! They have an eternal property; for the fundamental principles of such a religion must ever remain the same. It is indeed the case that divine truth, when it descends to man, does not always obtain a suitable reception. It must take its way through men's intellect. Hence it is the lot of every religion to be apprehended, interpreted and practised, very much according to the other leading views and intellectual characteristics of its disciples. Since the cultivation and intelligence of a people are different at different times, since periods of light alternate in history with periods of darkness, it is not strange that religion did not always and everywhere meet with minds prepared to receive it; and yet it was obliged, like all other science, to adapt itself to the whole mental character of those to whom it came. Individuals may constitute exceptions to this; but such is not the character of the whole race.

But whatever fate true religion may meet with, such is its nature, that it quietly disengages itself from connexion and misinterpretation with the mass of other sciences and arts, and rises to that purity so peculiarly its own. On this account it can never become useless; the period will never arrive when we must lay it aside. If no hindrances or important obstructions intervene in the way of its equal pace with the human mind, it ever accompanies us through all situations without violent changes: it is beneficent without exhibiting terrible phenomena; not like the tempest and earthquake, but like the succession of the seasons, which are rough or kindly according to the terrestrial changes which occasion them.

The first universal religion was derived from Judaism. There was its groundwork, monotheism, together with many other principles naturally flowing from this. It was Jesus of Nazareth who first took so extended a view as to grasp in his mind the idea of a *religion for the whole world*, and first succeeded in reducing that idea to a reality. If ever before any mortal, for instance the son of Sophroniscus, attained an idea of the kind, he failed in attempting to extend it among a people



who far surpassed all others in cultivation and susceptibility to truth and beauty. Jesus seized those fundamental principles which were current among his countrymen; discarded everything which had merely a local, civil, or national reference; selected the purely moral, refined and elevated it to its true dignity, and rendered it complete by supplying its deficiency.

True, he invested it anew with the authority of the positive institution of the Supreme Being, from whom he derived his commission; but he freed it from the influence of civil coercion, and simply submitted it to faith and judgment, that all men, each according to his capacity, might share in it, and that all their talents might be developed and exercised upon it and thereby constantly improved.

Although, with a wise regard to intellectual weakness, all our duties are separately presented and enjoined, yet no one is hindered from searching throughout creation for their grounds and combining them in one complete system. Indeed Jesus himself communicated to us the first rudiments of such a course, summoning all our powers into spirited action, thrusting us out, as it were, into boundless space, and presenting the universe to our faculties that we might gather from it knowledge and wisdom. Hitherto the first principle of social life alone had been discovered, viz. so to conduct towards men ourselves, as we would wish them to conduct towards us; but Jesus often pointed to the fundamental doctrines of *morality*, to the sustaining and disinterestedly active First Cause of the beauty and happiness of universal existence—thus introducing his more enlightened disciples into the whole field of nature, there to search out the plan of the Deity, and to examine systematically what he has given in precepts, and to expound from the order of things what he has declared as the absolute injunctions of the universal Parent.

As a matter not within human disposal, Jesus aimed at the sanction of his precepts by inculcating a higher destiny, and by pointing forward to a future state, the reality of which before his time had been only conjectured by great and wise men, but had never been generally believed. Thus, by opening to his disciples a view into another more active system of being, he transferred the reward of virtue and the punishment of vice from this life which often crowns with success the undertakings of the wicked, gave to the soul a lofty elevation above the interests of this present moment, and warmed it to anticipate and hope for a more delightful condition as the reward for the offering of a life well-spent in the present world.

Thus did Jesus elevate the Mosaic constitution into a religion which, under many changes and reverses, has been the guide to our present cultivation, and which has the distinguished honor above all other religions of being the governess, or at least the nurse, of the most civilized and ingenious nations of the earth. He therefore who would discredit it, has not taken a comprehensive view of it, or charges to its account those human follies which it had not sufficient authority to prevent. As to him who imagines that he can now go alone and stands in no need of such a staff—we have neither space nor leisure to dispute with him here. Let him not however cast away this staff with haughty self-confidence, but let him deposite it with grateful homage before religion's altars. Could any one have derided the beneficent Deity in

the temple of Epidaurus, when he was enabled to lay aside his crutches and depart without their aid? Is not the hand of the mother who taught us to walk, worthy of reverence?

What Jesus further communicated to his disciples respecting certain mysterious doctrines, cannot now be brought into view for the purpose of estimating the value of his religion in this respect, inasmuch as the different sects which bear his name are by no means agreed concerning them. We should be obliged to commence our inquiries with a controversy, upon which we shall not be qualified to enter until they have been brought to a conclusion.

The observations already made, may enable us to judge respecting the usefulness of this religion in supplying the general need of mankind, and respecting the importance which ought to be accorded to researches concerning the books in which it is contained.

### § 2. *Number of these books.*

Jesus of Nazareth appeared as a teacher in Judea under Tiberius, and was there condemned to death by the Roman procurator, Pontius Pilate. This did not however prevent his disciples from spreading themselves, not only in that country, but into other parts of the Roman empire, and even into the capital itself.<sup>1</sup>

An account of the remarkable part of his life and the doctrines which he taught is contained in the books of the Christians, which, in their opinion, were written by his earliest disciples. These comprise five historical books, viz. the Gospels of Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John, and the Acts of the Apostles, a book which narrates the progress of his doctrines after his death; and several didactic writings, viz. fourteen Epistles of the apostle Paul, and seven of other apostles. The fourteen Epistles of Paul are addressed to the following collections of the followers of Jesus—one to the church at Rome, two to that at Corinth, one to that at Galatia, one to that at Ephesus, one to that at Philippi, one to that at Colosse, two to that at Thessalonica, two to Timothy his assistant, one to Titus, one to Philemon, and one to the Hebrews. Of the seven Epistles of the other Apostles, one was written by James, two by Peter, three by John, and one by Jude. The Apocalypse, which closes the collection, forms a class by itself; it is held to be prophetic.

### § 3. *Genuineness of them. Internal proofs of the genuineness of the historical books.*

*Are now this alleged origin and antiquity justly ascribed to these writings, or have they crept into such repute without sufficient reason?* This is naturally the previous question, lying at the foundation of all other inquiries. If this be answered unfavourably, not only are all our former observations upon the doctrines and designs of Jesus ill-founded,

---

<sup>1</sup> Cornel. Tacit. Annal. L. xv. n. 44. Gronov.

but it will, indeed, be very difficult to discover anything upon which dependence can be placed respecting the system and objects of this sage instructor.

There are two sources of information respecting the genuineness or spuriousness of these writings; viz. *Internal Evidence*, and the *Testimony of ancient writers*, who have mentioned them and so proved their existence, or have named their authors.

We will first consider the historical books of the New Testament with reference to the *internal grounds* of their genuineness.

Suppose a person should unexpectedly light upon these books without any previous knowledge of them, (the subject is treated much in this way by a late writer<sup>1</sup>), and, possessing the ability to read them, should open them—what opinion would such a man form as to their origin, antiquity, and authors, merely from their internal character?

They are written in Greek, he would say, and certainly not in any one of the proper dialects of that language, but in a corrupted style of expression and construction, which frequently so much resembles the Hebrew in the use of words and in grammatical arrangement, that one would think their authors were Jews who spoke Greek. They exhibit, too, so little learning and historical art, that it is plain they are the compositions of ordinary men, who, with the exception of some Jewish reading, make no pretensions to education or attainments in literature. The narrative itself is of such a character that, notwithstanding its brevity, the very air and features of the persons concerned, their attitude and motions, the part of the spectators, the expression of their countenances, their whole behaviour, seem to be present before the eyes.—Such would necessarily be the language of one who, with no previous account of them, should pass judgment upon these books from their internal character alone.

And this is exactly what Christians assert respecting them, viz. that they were written by men of Jewish descent, who were all of humble origin and rank, without a learned education, whose knowledge of the events which they recorded was either that of eye-witnesses, or obtained directly from eye-witnesses.

We may argue too as follows: Biographies of remarkable men always present a more or less complete picture of their age and country, the state of civil affairs and of manners, and other circumstances under which they appeared, with which their life was surrounded and their actions came in contact. In proportion to the intimacy of the acquaintance we possess with all these peculiarities and circumstances, and with the whole picture of the age, we are able to discern whether the writers had seen those days to which their narrative pertains, or how remotely they lived from them. The truth on this point is the more strikingly manifest, the more the biography enters into details, and the more numerous and delicate are the relations under which the personage, who is its subject, appears.

In this view, especial importance attaches itself to the labors of those learned men who investigate the political state of the country in which

---

<sup>1</sup> Gottfried Less, Ueber die Religion, ihre Geschichte und Bestätigung. I. Th. II. Abschn. § 28.



Jesus appeared; examine into its social condition and civil regulations; collect together contemporary events which had a more or less close relation to N. T. occurrences and are incidentally referred to in the narrative; and further, seek out the historical personages who bore a part in the events of the time, particularly in Palestine, and gather together the traces of their lives and character to be found in ancient authors, in order to try the historical books of the New Testament by these data, and to put to the proof the qualifications of their authors.<sup>1</sup>

Now the N. T. writers everywhere evince an uncommonly accurate knowledge of affairs, and a degree of intimacy with the period to which Christ belongs, such as could be possessed only by contemporaries.

The more one descends to particulars on this point and observes the development of the opinions, customs, and manners peculiar to this period, in the discourse and actions of the individuals introduced, the more absolutely convinced must he become, that the authors of these books themselves passed their days in the midst of these very circumstances.

On these circumstances depends Christ's conduct as a moral teacher. The demeanour of others towards him and their treatment of him spring from these; and the descriptions of his solitary situations depend ultimately for their fidelity upon these.

If he falls in company with Pharisees, the mutual deportment of the parties, the truths he presents to view and his application of them, all must be regulated on very different principles from those which guide when he converses with Sadducees or enters into their society. When he meets with Samaritans, another chain of ideas commences, other circumstances come into operation which give character to his intercourse with them. If he stands among his disciples and addresses the common people, he has to deal with still other hopes, desires, and prejudices, with other moral qualities, and his discourse must run through another circle of thought. In conduct too they must appear a different people; on one side, with hearts open to the reception of truth, zealous and pious—but on the other, rash, easily inflamed, furious in their religion, and forward to adopt violent measures without regard to consequences.

Now when we gather all from ancient authors that we can find which affords us any light on these points, and then apply it to particular cases in the N. T., we find ourselves, in the more trifling as well as in the main incidents, constantly carried back into the circumstances of these days. The Pharisees and Sadducees really appeared and thought just as we see them in these books; such were the prejudices of the Samaritans, such the mutual ill-will between the Jews and themselves; such was the spirit of the common people; and their character lives and moves in the N. T. just as it presents itself in the history of

---

<sup>1</sup> The credibility of the Gospel History, or the facts occasionally mentioned in the N. T. confirmed by passages of ancient authors. By Nathaniel Lardner, Lond. 1727, & second ed. 1733. In Latin; cum praef. Christ. Wolfii, Braemae 1730. Also, A view of the Evidences of Christianity, in three parts, by William Paley, in two volumes, 4th ed. Lond. 1795.

the times, fickle-minded, hasty and blind in their passions, showing themselves in relation to two different constitutions both strictly regardful of duty and completely lawless, and easily excited to tumult and sedition.

So too with the foreign regulations and customs which were introduced into Judea, and gave a cast to the national condition, such as it never had before even in the time of Herod the Great, and never again wore. The vexing *census* exhibits all the freshly-awakened theocratic fancies of the Jews, and paints their feelings towards the Romans, just as they actually were.<sup>1</sup> The precept in respect to reconciliation (Matt. 5: 25. Luke 12: 58) has circumstantial reference to the Roman law *de injuriis*, by which the complainant was empowered, without the necessity of a summons by the magistrate, to drag the offender with his own hand to the judge, *in jus rapit*. On the way thither he had opportunity to make a composition, *transactio*; but if this was not effected, a fine was imposed upon him, and, if unable to pay it, he remained in close confinement until it was discharged.<sup>2</sup>

When Jesus converses or associates with publicans, throughout the whole scene the Roman farming-system and its oppressions are presented to our view. Again when he drives the money-changers out of the temple with scourges, we notice the consequences of Roman supremacy and the influence of foreign manners; for the *argentarii* of Rome were accustomed to set up their tables, *mensas*, near the statues of the gods, at the feet of Janus (*Horat. Epis. Lib. I. Ep. 1.*), in the most sacred places, *in porticibus basilicarum*, and near the temples, *pone ædem Castoris*.<sup>3</sup> We remark also the Roman toleration which permitted no violation of the temples and religions of other nations, and under the sanction of which a private Jew vindicated without opposition the sacred character of his Temple, which at Rome no laws could protect from desecration.

The parable Matt. 18: 23 presents to view a king or tetrarch, who as to himself and his own affairs was not subject to the Roman jurisdiction, and therefore proceeds according to the ancient Jewish law. But the sequel which relates to a private person is represented in accordance with the Roman statutes against the *obæratos*, by which the debtor who became insolvent was given up to the creditor, *addicebatur*. The latter then bound him, *in nervum ducebat*, and kept him in his house as a prisoner, wholly at his arbitrary disposal. The rigour of this statute was, it is true, somewhat mitigated *per legem Poeteliam*, but afterwards and in the days of which we are speaking, the ancient severity had again revived, as it appears in this moral fiction.<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Joseph. Bell. Jud. L. II. c. 12. p. 727. Ed. Basil. or according to Havercamp's ed. L. II. c. 8. Compare Antiq. L. XVIII. c. 1. n. 6. also L. XVII. c. 3. n. 4.

<sup>2</sup> Heineccii antiqq. jur. Rom. illustr. Lib. IV. Tit. 4. n. 1. seqq. Compare with Lib. IV. Tit. 6. n. 14 & 16.

<sup>3</sup> Symbol. Litt. Bremens. T. J. N. Funccii Dissertatio de hominib. in foro Rom. nequam. (It is more than possible that Horace in the passage alluded to refers to a street which was called Janus, and not to any statue of Janus. Compare Horat. Sat. II. 3. 18. Cicero. Phil. VI. 5.—Tr.)

<sup>4</sup> Compare Drackenborch's note on Tit. Liv. L. VIII. c. 38. Gellius Noct. Att. L. XX. c. 4. p. 282. Aldi Manut. Tacit. Annal. III. c. 60.

This blending of customs and manners obtained in innumerable other things. Take for example the various kinds of money. We meet at one time with Greek, at another with Roman, and at another with the ancient Jewish coins. But how accurately is this thing too adjusted, according to the circumstances of the times! The ancient taxes, which were introduced before the Roman dominion, are estimated in Greek money; e. g. the temple-tribute, or *διδραχμον*. (Matt. 17 : 24. Joseph. B. J. L. VII. c. 6. n. 6.) The offerings were made, also, in this money. (Mark. 12 : 42. Luke 21 : 2.) A payment which is made out of the temple-treasury, is made in the ancient national pounds. (Matt. 26 : 15.) But in business, trade, payment of wages, etc., the *assis* and *denarius* and other Roman coins are usually employed. (Matt. 10 : 29. Luke 12 : 6. Matt. 20 : 2. Mark. 14 : 5. John 12 : 5. 6 : 7.) The new taxes, likewise, are estimated in the money of the nation which then possessed the sovereignty. (Matt. 22 : 19. Mark. 12 : 15. Luke 20 : 24.)

Writers, who in such trifling circumstances (which on any other supposition would have been wholly overlooked) so exactly accord with the truth, must certainly have been personally familiar with them.

#### § 4.

Our investigation might be conducted with reference simply to geographical circumstances. The geography and topography of a country change from time to time, through the influence of active industry and improvement, natural phenomena, politics, and arms. They are in a perpetual fluctuation, which, not only in a long course of time, between the greater epochs, but in shorter periods, causes striking alterations. Hence writers who attempt to delineate historical occurrences, the scene of which is laid at some distance from their own time, are exposed to many mistakes; and we can thus easily judge at what distance of time they were from the events which they describe. It was especially difficult for the ancients to avoid errors of this kind, since they possessed very few properly so called geographical helps. The history of literature presents several examples of impostures, which have been unveiled in this way. We will not however notice these further, but will put to the test more distinguished and better informed writers, who have sometimes been guilty of similar inaccuracies.

Glareau, formerly an ornament of the Freyburg school, contested the genuineness of Quintus Curtius, on account of the geographical mistakes, which this author has committed. The ancients long ago pointed out a remarkable oversight of this nature in Virgil.<sup>1</sup> Even Livy has sometimes, through forgetfulness, applied a later geography to events of ancient date. Thus he speaks of Sinuessa, Præneste, Arpi, instead of Synope, Argos-Hippium, and Stephane.

The observation which we have the opportunity of making in this view, in regard to the life of Appollonius Tyaneus, would have been peculiarly gratifying to the ancient Christians. Philostratus, the phi-

<sup>1</sup> Aul. Gellius. Noct. Attic. L. X. c. 16.



philosopher, is its author, and pretends to have compiled it out of the commentaries and records of Damis, who was not only a contemporary of Apollonius, but his friend and his companion in all his travels. Among other things, the hero of this book appears in Babylon, and on this occasion a description of the celebrated city is given us, not a word of which is applicable to the period, for Babylon was then solitary and almost wasted, Selucia having long since absorbed its splendor.<sup>1</sup> He confounds the people of Sparta with the Lacedemonians, as though the two people composed one state as formerly. He represents Sparta as still a free state, while it was really under Roman dominion, and only the (so called) Eleutherolacones, separated from Sparta, continued free through the clemency of Augustus.<sup>2</sup> Is it possible that these are the accounts of an eye-witness and contemporary? Is it not plain, that the commentaries of Damis are but a dishonest pretence; and that the author of this biography by no means drew from the contemporary sources of which he boasts?

Now if persons, who did not possess such extensive learning as this philosopher, affixed the names of older writers to their works, in order to invest them with value from their antiquity, what must have been the consequence? Just examine the history of the Jewish war, which passes under the name of Hegesippus the Jew. He lived under Antoninus and Commodus; and yet this work makes mention of Constantinople, Scotland, and Saxony.<sup>3</sup>

Difficult as it must generally have been for a historian, who had selected for his subject events of a remote period, to represent them in accordance with the actual geographical situation of the country, it would have been incomparably more difficult for a writer who had to treat of the occurrences in the Jewish state which took place immediately before its dissolution, supposing him to have lived at a later time. The many changes which preceded this period; the dreadful event itself, which so completely effaced all traces of the city and its environs, that, in the words of an eye-witness,<sup>4</sup> it might be doubted whether they had ever been the abode of man: the subsequent commotions, which gave a new face to the whole country, rendered it almost impossible that one of a later age could do this. Add to this, that under Hadrian fifty important places and nine hundred and eighty-five villages and hamlets were razed to the ground,<sup>5</sup> and then judge in what a predicament the historian was placed, who had to represent the country as it was in the days of Tiberius.

The laborious collections, and united works of the learned on the geography and topography of Palestine at different periods, have placed us in a situation to judge how far the historical books of the N. T. present such a picture of the country, and connect with events such chorographical circumstances, as suit the period to which the events belong.

1 Vita Apollon. Tyan. per. Philostrat. Lemn. Sen. L. I. c. 18.

2 Id. L. IV. c. 2.

3 Hegesipp. de Bell. Jud. Lib. III. c. 5, and L. V. c. 15.

4 Joseph. de Bell. Jud. Lib. VII. c. 1.

5 Dio Xiphilin. in vit. Hadr. p. 266. Hen. Steph.—8vo. Ed. Wechel. p. 974.

Though these works and collections have indeed many chasms, and must necessarily have them, they are yet sufficiently complete to enable us with certainty to detect and denounce mistakes, and determine the real age of such writings as falsely arrogate to themselves higher antiquity.

All these learned investigations and comparisons may be regarded as a process of induction, according to which a perfect insight into the geographical condition of the period in which the events took place must be conceded to the historical books of the N. T. We will here put to the test a few cases, some of which we may perhaps contribute to elucidate.

It is often the case that our historians, without expressly mentioning topographical or geographical circumstances, so narrate events, that these circumstances are involved in them and must be deduced by the reader. The more we learn in respect to places and their situation, the more plain it is that the narrative is always accurately regulated by topography.

Jesus is led to Pilate to be judged; but the Jews would not go into the Prætorium, on account of the feast, lest they should be defiled. Jesus was led out to receive his sentence; and Pilate sat in a place called the *Lithostroton* to pass judgment. (John 19: 13.) The transaction is represented as if this place was in front of the Prætor's house, or at least at no great distance from it. And, there is, in fact, such a place, which has been formerly overlooked, in the outworks of the Temple. Mention is made of it, on occasion of an assault which the Romans made upon the Temple, on the side of the tower Antonia.<sup>1</sup> Here is the *Lithostroton*; and the house of the Prætor must have been opposite to this place. Now he lived, as appears from some incidental passages in Philo, in Herod's palace.<sup>2</sup> This was certainly in this quarter and neighborhood, northwest of the tower Antonia and the Temple, so that the proximity of the *Lithostroton* to the palace, which is implied in John's narrative, is perfectly accurate.

Peter and John went to the Temple: when they arrived at the gate called Beautiful, a man, who was lame from his birth and was daily carried there to beg, asked alms of them. They made him whole; he enters the Temple, and the people throng around him, astonished at his recovery. The Apostles afterwards enter; he perceives them in Solomon's porch, leaves the crowd, and embraces them as his benefactors. (Acts 3:). Such a gate, distinguished above the rest for its beauty, led into the Temple from the East,<sup>3</sup> and moreover, the *Στοὰ Σολομωντος* lay here on the East;<sup>4</sup> so that the several parts of the occurrence are

<sup>1</sup> Joseph. Bell. Jud. L. VI. c. 6 and 7. p. 868 and 869. Ed. Basil. *Καὶ κατὰ λιθόστρωτον τρέχων κ. τ. λ.* Haverc. c. 1. n. 8.

<sup>2</sup> Philo, De legat. ad. Caium says: Pilate had hung up gilded ensigns (of which Josephus also speaks, Archæol. L. XVIII. c. 4.) *ἐν τοῖς Ἡρώδου βασιλείοις* and immediately after says that this occurred in the Prætor's dwelling: *καὶ τότε μὲν ἡ ἀνάθεσις ἐν οἰκίᾳ τῶν ἐπιτρόπων ἦν.* Compare Faber, Archæologie der Hebræer I. Th. 323 in the note.

<sup>3</sup> Joseph. Bell. Jud. L. V. c. 14. p. 841. Basil. and Haverc. c. 5. n. 3.

<sup>4</sup> Jos. Archæol. L. XX. c. 8. p. 621 and Haverc. c. 9. n. 7

not distributed to places incompatible with each other, but are adjusted according to the actual plan of the edifice.

Beth-Phage, a place insignificant in itself, and almost unnoticed in history, is often mentioned in the Gospels. (Matth. 21: 1. Mark 11: 1. Luke 19: 29.) According to them, it was without the city, yet not far from Jerusalem. It so happens that the Talmudic books have mentioned it; but very differently from the Gospels. According to them, Beth-Phage must have been situated, not without, but within the city.

So says Lightfoot, a man skilled in this kind of learning (*Chorogr. Matthæo præmissa* c. 37); and he unhesitatingly places Beth-Phage within the circuit of the city-walls. Reland, who could best have assisted us in this case, contented himself with censuring Lightfoot.

In the *Gemar. Babyl. or Mishnah Sanhedrin*. (c. 1. § 3.) the following question is proposed: What if the carcase of a dead person should be found *exposed in the city*? נמצא בעליל לעיר? The reply is, They should go and examine.—But if it were found in Beth-Phage, נמצא בבית פג, and the inhabitants opposed their inquest, ought they to regard it as an insurrection in Beth-Phage? Reply: They should go there to examine. Here are evidently two cases opposed to each other: in the city, and in Beth-Phage. Yet Lightfoot was induced by the gloss: בית-פגי מקום לפנים מן הומת העיר ונדון כירושלים לכל דבריו to interpret the passage differently, though not without violence: “*si invenerit synedrium cœdens in Bethphage &c.*” Nothing is said any where of a Synedrium in Beth-Phage. The word נמצא is used with reference to Deut. 21: 1. כי ימצא הלה, i. e. if such a *corpus delicti* should be found. Indeed the gloss, closely examined, does not signify what Lightfoot supposes. True, פנים in the Talmudic language often signifies the inside; but the sequel would then be superfluous. If it were within the city-walls, it would be understood of itself, that it was to be regarded like the city. Thus he might better have translated it: *Bethphage locus est in conspectu manium urbis, quantum ad omnia tamen utebatur jure Hierosolymorum*. Still less does the second place to which he refers, (*Gemar. Babyl. Tract. Pesachim*,) support his position. To the question, What is without the walls? R. Johanna replies, הוץ להומת בית-פג. *Est* must be understood both in question and answer: *Extra mania est Beth-Phage*. So says the gloss in different words מקום היצון שברושלים, *a place of those without Jerusalem*. In the *Mishnah*, (*Tract. Menachot*. c. XI. n. 1, 2.) R. Jehuda maintains in respect to the question, whether the shewbread and the two loaves of Pentecost, which were baked in the courts of the Temple, might be kneaded without, בחוץ, that all must be performed in the Temple. In opposition to this, R. Simeon adduces a tradition that they might as well be kneaded in Beth-Phage as in the courts of the Temple. Far different from the fanciful interpretation which R. B. Maïmon gives, this passage only imports that it might be done, not only in the courts of the temple, but also in Jerusalem and in the adjoining places, which possessed equal rights with Jerusalem. The book ספרי, the oldest commentary on Deuteronomy infers, (chap. 29: 35,) from the word עזרת that, on the great day of the feast, no one ought to go out of Jerusalem: compare *Mishnah Tr. Megill.* c. I.



n. 11. Yet he makes the exception, that whoever had come from Beth-Phage might return home and sleep there. עצרו הכתוב מלצאת הררי שהביא קדשנו מבית-פגי לירושלם שומע אני יאכלם בירושלם וילון בבית-פגי: All these passages separate Beth-Phage from Jerusalem: they fix it indeed in the vicinity of the city, but without the walls, with-in sight of them. From the query whether when Beth-Phage was in commotion, there might be said to be an insurrection, we may infer what was the importance of this place, as to size and number of inhabitants.

At Jericho curiosity induces the chief of the publicans to ascend a tree in order to see Jesus; and at Capernaum the Lord calls a publican from the receipt of custom by the sea-side to follow him. Both circumstances are natural.

In the great hollow which is formed by the mountains about Jericho grew the balsam, the chief production of Judea, and its principal and most abundant article of traffic.<sup>1</sup> From this place it was sent abroad, and here the taxes which were imposed upon it must have been levied. Thus the chief publican is in his proper chorographical position.

The Phœnicians, and especially the Aradians, despatched their articles of merchandise to more southern countries, by means of the Jordan.<sup>2</sup> Their *depôt* was thus necessarily on the north of Gennesaret at Capernaum; and collectors of the customs would not be wanting here.

Our Lord was at Capernaum; and on the following day proceeds to Nain. (Luke 7: 1—11.) His fame spreads rapidly before him, in the direction of Judea; he comes into the vicinity of the Baptist, (v. 17, 18,) and, still further south, into the suburbs of the Holy City, where Mary Magdalene dwells. Luke, we perceive, is describing a journey of Jesus from Galilee to Jerusalem. Now Josephus tells us, that, when the Galileans went on festival seasons to the Holy City, they passed through the place called Nais, which lay on their route: *Ἔθος ἦν τοῖς Γαλιλαίοις ἐν ταῖς ἑορταῖς εἰς τὴν ἱερὴν πόλιν παραγενομένοις ὁδεύειν διὰ τῆς Σαμαριῶν χώρας, καὶ καθ' ὁδὸν αὐτοῖς κόμης τῆς Ναῖς λεγομένης.* (Ant. L. XX. c. 6.) Thus Jesus follows a route which would lead him through the little city, in which we find him working a beneficent miracle. (Luke 7: 11—17.)

But Hudson and Havercamp deprive us of this passage in Josephus, and alter the name of the place, because it is not written alike in all the manuscripts. They read *κόμης Γινάϊας λεγομένης*. But why change the text? Most manuscripts and printed copies have *Ναῖς*; the other readings according to Ruffinus, are *Ναναῖς*, *Γεναῖς*, *Γενας*, *Γιναῖς*. Now *Ναναῖς* is only a mistake of the copyist in repeating the two first letters; and is easily resolved into *Ναῖς*. Even *Γιναῖς* and *Γινάϊας* originated from *Ναῖς*. If, as is often the case, the letter *T* of the article *Τῆς* (*Ναῖς*) were half effaced, *κόμης Τῆς Ναῖς λεγομένης* would be read; and the conjectures of the copyist in order to get rid of this *γῆς* would produce *Γιναῖς*, *Γινάϊας*, &c.

<sup>1</sup> Justin. Epitome Trogi. L. XXXV. c. 3. "Opes gentis ex vectigalibus opo. balsami crevere."

<sup>2</sup> Strabo. L. XVI. p. 519. Casaub. 1787. *Τὸν Ἀνίκον, καὶ τὸν Ἰορδάνην ἀναπλέοντι φορτίοις, Ἀραδιοὶ μάλιστ' α. τ. λ.*

The second passage of Josephus, in which he repeats the same fact, is still more corrupt in its readings, (*Bell. Jud.* L. II. c. 12. n. 3.) *Γῆμαν*, "Ωβαν, Βᾶν, Βοῦν. As it can be explained how the former *Γιναίαν* became *Γάμαν*, so it is very evident how *Ναῖν* might in rapid writing degenerate into *Βᾶν*. It is known that in MSS. of the 10th and onward to the 13th century β is very similar to ν, and α can scarcely be distinguished from αι.—The third passage which mentions this place (*Bell. Jud.* L. III. c. 3. n. 4.) gives us the readings, *Γιναίας*, *Γηνίας*, *Γινέας*, *Genaniæ*, all which, *Γι-ναίας*, *Γη νίας*, *Γη νανίας*, resolve themselves into *Τῆς Ναῖς*.

In order to get at the matter more fully, we must observe that the doubtful place was situated in the plain, *μέγα πεδῖον*, on which the province of Samaria bordered, (*Ant.* XX. 6.) or in the plain in which the Samaritan country commenced. (*B. J.* II. 12. 3. III. 3. 4.) Reland rightly distinguishes two plains of this description (*Pal. Lib.* I, c. 55.) viz. the *μέγα πεδῖον Αεγενῶς* which extended southward towards Samaria, and the *μέγα πεδῖον πρὸς Πτολεμαῖδα* which extended in a northwest direction towards Ptolemais. Both met at the foot of Mount Tabor. But here, on the south of Tabor, at a small distance from it, consequently at the entrance of the Samaritan plain, lay Nain. (*Euseb. de Loc. Hebr.* *Ναῖς κώμη* . . . καὶ νῦν ἐστὶ μετὰ νότον Θάβωρ. In respect to its distance from Tabor, see the note of Vallarsi *ad h. l.*, *Opp. Hieronym.* T. III. p. 285, and *Reland. Palest.* L. III. v. *Nain.*) Luke calls the place *πόλις*; Josephus only *κώμη*. But this makes no difference: it is the custom of Josephus to designate small places, even if they had walls, gates, and fortifications, simply by the word *κώμη*. (*Ant.* XVII. c. 2. n. 2. c. 10. n. 9. XX. c. 6. n. 2. *B. J.* IV. c. 2. n. 3. c. 8, n. 4. 5.)

In Acts 8: 26, the city Gaza is mentioned, with the remark that it is desert—*αὐτὴ ἐστὶν ἔρημος*. It is true, this was often its fate; but it was invariably rebuilt, and was so in the days of Herod the Great, not long before the event which is here related. Uncommon erudition has been employed to solve this difficulty; (*Wesseling. Not. ad Diodor. Lib.* XIX. c. 80. p. 381. T. I. and *ad Itinerar. Antonini* p. 251 *Relandi Palestin.* p. 786.) but there are two words in Josephus, which have escaped the learned, from which we learn how well Luke was acquainted with an event concerning which all history else is silent. A short time before the siege of Jerusalem, the Jewish revolution, on account of the slaughter of the Jews in Cæsarea, had assumed a decisive character; and, in revenge, the Jews burnt or otherwise laid waste a multitude of villages and cities in Syria and the vicinity. Among these was Gaza, which they destroyed (*Bell. Jud.* L. II. c. 33. p. 751. *Basil.* c. 18. n. 1. *Haverc.* ἀλλ' ἐπὶ ταύταις πυρποληθείσαις, *Ανθόδονα καὶ Γάζαν κατέσκαπτον*.) Thus it was really in this condition when Luke wrote.

In Philippi there was a female dealer in purple from Thyatira (Acts 16: 14); and indeed there has been found amidst the ruins of Thyatira a monument which attests that this city once had such a trade which supported a distinct class of persons.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> George Wheeler's Journey into Greece, Vol. III. p. 233. French translation T. I. p. 116. Spon has given this inscription more correctly in his *Miscellanea Erudit. Antiquitatis*, p. 113.

ΑΓΛΘΗ ΤΤΧΗ  
ΑΝΤ. ΚΑ. ΑΛΦΗΝΟΝ ΑΡΙΓΝΩΤΟΝ  
ΚΡΑΤΙΣΤΟΝ ΕΠΙΤΡΟΠΟΝ ΤΟΥ ΣΕΒ.

. . . ΤΟΝ ΚΑΙ ΣΕΜΝΟΤΑΤΟΝ ΙΕΡΕΑ ΤΟΥ ΠΡΟ  
ΠΟΛΕΟΣ ΘΕΟΥ ΤΥΡΙΜΝΟΥ  
ΟΙ ΒΑΦΕΙΣ.

The book of Acts names a Proconsul of Cyprus; yet, it would seem, there should have been a Prætor there. In the division of the Roman empire, according to the plan of Augustus, Cyprus fell to the share of that monarch, and hence could not be governed by a Proconsul. The attempts which have been made to solve the difficulty have wholly failed. Numismatics alone inform us how well Luke knew the affairs of the time. Some coins, with the image and superscription of the Emperor Claudius, show upon the other side that at that time this alteration had taken place; they inform us of a Proconsul of Cyprus, who must have been the predecessor or successor of Sergius Paulus.<sup>1</sup> In the centre of the reverse is *ΚΤΙΡ/ΩΝ*, and, in a circle around the name of the island or its inhabitants, is the inscription:

*ΕΠΙ ΚΟΜΙΝΙΟΥ ΠΡΟΚΛΟΥ ΑΝΘΥΠΑΤΟΥ*

Paul arrives in an Alexandrian ship at Pozzuoli, (Acts 28: 11, 13, 14.) and pursues his journey thence to Rome by land. The Alexandrian merchantmen preferred Pozzuoli to all the harbors of Italy; here they discharged their rich freights.<sup>2</sup> They entered the port in fleets and singly, the crews crowned with wreaths and in gay attire, and were welcomed with lively joy.<sup>3</sup> Here the Alexandrians deposited their goods to be distributed throughout Italy.<sup>4</sup> In conformity with the course of these vessels, Paul landed just in this port.

Friends awaited his arrival at *Appii Forum*; and others at *Tres Tabernæ*. (Acts 28: 15.) Now if he proceeded towards Rome upon the canal which Cæsar had led through the Pontine marshes, on which he would travel more easily than upon the rough road which ran along by its side, he must have stopped, as here, at *Appii Forum*, which was the place of landing and embarkation.<sup>5</sup> Thus a part of his friends were

<sup>1</sup> Patin. Imp. Rom. Numism. in Claud. p. 101, who has not however happily explained it. Thesaurus Morelianus, sive Famil. Rom. Numism. ed Havercamp. in Famil. Comin. p. 108.—I have since discovered that this solution does not rest on Numismatics alone. (Dio Cass. l. LIV. in Augusto d. 523, ed. Wechel, τότε δ' οὖν καὶ τὴν Κύπρον καὶ τὴν Γαλατίαν τὴν Ναβυονησίαν ἀπέδωκε τῷ δήμῳ, ὥς μηδὲν τῶν ὅπλων αὐτοῦ δεόμεναι, καὶ οὕτως ἀνθύπατοι καὶ ἐς ἐκείνα τὰ ἔθνη πέμπεσθαι ἤρξαντο.

<sup>2</sup> Strabo. l. XVI. p. 793. Casaub. 2d Ed.

<sup>3</sup> Seneca, Epist. LXXVII. Sueton. in August. c. 98.

<sup>4</sup> Strabo, loc. cit.

<sup>5</sup> Acon. an Horat. Serm. l. I. Sat. V. 14. "quia ab Appii foro per paludes navigatur, quas paludes Cæsar derivavit." Porphyriou, ad vers. 4, "pervenisse ad Forum Appii indicat, ubi turba esset nautarum, item cauponum ibi morantium." Acorn. ad vers. 11. "per paludes navigarunt, quia via inierjacens durior."



anxious to receive him on his landing. Ten Roman *milliaria*, or two German miles nearer to Rome was the stage called *Tres Tabernæ*.<sup>1</sup> about where the road from Velletri enters the Pontine marshes. Here there was not so great a throng, and there were fewer annoyances than at Appii Forum,<sup>2</sup> on which account the place seems to have been frequented by the better classes.<sup>3</sup> Thus this company, likewise, of Paul's friends receives him at the proper place, and the whole accords accurately with topographical circumstances.

The manifold alterations in the names of places which occurred within a short period, often exposed our authors to fall into mistakes, and to betray their age, if they lived at a later time.

They speak of Sichem or Sichar. At a later period it was called *Φλαούια Νεάπολις Συρίας Παλαιστίνης*; which is its name on coins after the conquest, or, likewise, *ΦΑ ΝΕΑ ΜΗΤΡΟΠΟΛ ΜΟΡΘΙΑ*.<sup>4</sup> So the Samaritans called it; and likewise *Μαβάρθα*, according to Josephus, and Mamortha, as Pliny says: "Neapolis, quae ante Mamortha dicebatur." But our authors follow neither Samaritan nor Roman usage, but that of their own nation and period.—We sometimes meet with Cæsarea Philippi. At an earlier period it was called Paneas, and later *ΚΑΙΣΑΡΕΙΑ ΠΡΟΣ ΠΛΑΝΕΙΟΝ*, on coins and in books. They however say, as was usual in those times, when the builder was yet alive or not long dead, *Καισαρεία Φιλίππου*. So do their contemporaries.<sup>5</sup>

The following case is still more important. The Evangelists speak of Bethsaida, when it had no longer that name. About the same time With Cæsarea, it was enlarged and embellished, and called Julias. So it was called in Jesus' time, and so our historians ought to have called it. Were they not aware of this? What shall we say then of their age? It is precisely in this that they show the most accurate knowledge of the affairs of the time. Philip had, indeed, very much embellished this place, and raised it to the rank of a city with the name of Julias; but, not long after, Julia, from whom the city derived its name, was exiled by her own father. The wounded feelings of Augustus even wished that the world might forget she was his daughter.<sup>6</sup> After the death of Augustus, Tiberius, whose wife she had been, abandoned the unfortunate princess to the utmost wretchedness, and she died in a helpless condition.<sup>7</sup> Hence during two reigns adulation was obliged to suppress a name, for the use of which, in other circumstances, it might

<sup>1</sup> Itinerar. Antonini. edit. Wesseling. p. 107.

<sup>2</sup> Horat. Serm. L. I. Sat. V. 3, 4, 11, 12.

<sup>3</sup> Cicero ad Attic. L. II. Ep. 11 et 13.

<sup>4</sup> Harduin Numm. ant. popul. et urb. illustr. p. 340.

<sup>5</sup> Vita Josephi, p. 630. Basil. § 13 De Bell. Jud. L. VII. c. 1.

<sup>6</sup> "Abstinnitque a congressu hominum diu præ pudore, etiam de negandâ de-liberavit. Carte cum sub idem tempus una ex consociis liberta, Phœbe nomine, suspendio vitam finivisset; maluisse se ait Phœbes patrem fuisse." Sueton. in August. c. 65.

<sup>7</sup> Tacit. Annal L. 1. n. 53. "Imperium adeptus (Tiberius) extorrem, in famem, et omnis spei egenam, inopiâ longâ tabe peremit, obscuram fore necem longitudine exilii ratus."

have thought to gain favor. Afterwards this name was again current, and appears in Pliny's enumeration of the Jewish cities. It is by such incidental circumstances, which are so easily overlooked and the knowledge of which is so speedily lost, that acquaintance with a period is fully attested.<sup>1</sup>

But it is remarkable, it will be said, that John should have assigned this Bethsaida or Julias, where he was born, to Galilee, 12: 21. Must he not have known to what province his birth-place belonged?<sup>2</sup> Philip governed only the eastern countries on the Sea of Tiberias; Galilee pertained to his brother Antipas. Thus, Bethsaida or Julias could not have been built by Philip, as it certainly was, or it did not belong to Galilee, as John asserts. A mistake of this character would indeed afford sufficient ground for the rejection of John's Jospel. Julias lay, however, in Gaulonitis, which country was, indeed, politically separated from Galilee, but the *usus loquendi* of those times obstinately reckoned the province of Gaulonitis to Galilee. Now if John does so, it only proves that the peculiar usage of the times was not unknown to him; he expresses himself as was then customary. Thus Josephus tells us of Judas the Gaulonite of Gamala,<sup>3</sup> and, in the next paragraph, calls him the Galilean, and in another work also uses respecting him the same expression.<sup>4</sup> We may hence infer, that in this case the custom of the times paid homage to an older division of the country and disregarded the existing political geography.

Is it possible that historians who, as in these few instances, invariably apply to the period so nice a knowledge of minute geographical circumstances, did not write their books until the scenes of the events had become undiscoverable, when not only their country was laid waste, but the national existence of the Jews was annihilated?

## § 5.

The didactic writings, also, have internal evidences, or as is sometimes said, the stamp of a certain period, as well in respect to matter as manner.

As respects the matter, they possess a peculiar character as to those subjects on which the feelings and ideas of mankind perpetually change; or they contain local and temporal references to persons, manners, errors, and follies, which are different in different periods and countries.

As respects the manner—in the arrangement and mode of treating a subject, in the arguments used to support positions, and in the style and costume.

<sup>1</sup> Pellerin (Recueil des médailles, Tom. I. and II.) gives, however, some coins of Julia, and one of Julias, as belonging to this period. He was supposed to be correct, till Eckhel exposed the mistake, in Doctrina Num. Vet. Part. I. Vol. III. pag. 479, 498.

<sup>2</sup> Brun's Handb. der alten Erdbeschr. Vol. II. Part. I. c. VI. p. LVIII.

<sup>3</sup> Archæol. XVIII. 1. 'Ιούδας Γαυλονίτης ἀνὴρ ἐκ πόλεως ὄνομα Γάμαλα.

<sup>4</sup> XVIII. 2. 'Ο Γαλιλαῖος Ιούδας. p. 549. De Bell. Jud. II. 12. p. 727. Τὸς ἀνὴρ Γαλιλαῖος Ιούδας ὄνομα. According to Havercamp XVIII. c. 1. n. 6. and B. J. II. c. 8.

These considerations at present hold only in regard to the undisputed scriptures, viz. thirteen Epistles of Paul and the first of Peter and John. Of the others, of each separately, we shall speak elsewhere.

As to the matter—these writings are not general compositions without local fitness or any particular purpose. They were called forth by occasions, extorted by the circumstances of the authors, and are therefore adapted to certain occasions, and to certain readers and their particular wants. If now these books are supported by other remains of the period, if the picture of the times which their authors had before their minds when they wrote them possesses historical truth, then it is clear that their writings are not based on arbitrary and self-contrived scenes. The more minute this picture was, and the more accurately it was before their minds, the more necessary it is to suppose that they themselves were personally acquainted with the period.

Now we find in the Acts of the Apostles several facts incidentally presented, respecting persons or circumstances mentioned in Paul's Epistles, or affording incidental aid towards their elucidation. When such incidental hints are duly examined and those writings are compared with them, an agreement is perceived between them such as could be expected only from letters which were, as they profess to be, intimately connected with these events.<sup>1</sup>

If we further remark the local weaknesses, vices and errors which Paul censures in his Epistles, and which they were meant to correct, as, e. g., in Crete, Corinth, Ephesus, and compare them with those mentioned by Greek and Roman authors, who have incidentally noticed such traits,—we shall often make the pleasing discovery that Paul's Epistles treat of exactly the errors of the time or local vices which these authors have sometimes delineated with yet deeper severity and satire. We shall have opportunity in the separate examination of these Epistles to fortify by proof an observation which we merely hint at here.

Moreover, the general contents of these writings of Paul, Peter and John, are of a strikingly peculiar character. They present us with a peculiar system of morals and virtue,—not like the Jewish system, but one more human, more general, purer, more exalted. Nor is it that of the Greeks; it is not the political and warlike virtue of the Romans; it is no Stoic or Academic virtue; and no sophistical and declamatory worldly wisdom. It is the system of Jesus as, according to the four biographical accounts of him, he presented and inculcated it. Hence their writers may well have been what they claim to have been, his auditors and his disciples.

In the Acts of the Apostles we find doctrinal discourses of Paul and Peter, which exhibit their respective views of God and Jesus, of virtue, religion and Judaism. And these are of such a nature that they as it were form one whole with the contents of these Epistles; and letters and discourses together comprise a single theory, the parts of which are scattered throughout both.

---

<sup>1</sup> This argument William Paley has sometimes happily managed, in his "*Horæ Paulinæ, or The truth of the Scripture History of St. Paul evinced, by a comparison of his Epistles with the Acts of the Apostles.*" London, 1790. The argument, as he has stated it in the title, may be inverted.



That part of Christ's instructions and discourses which most struck John's mind and of which he retained a more lively remembrance than the other historians, and of which his Gospel is made up, is also visibly prominent in his Epistle, as if, indeed, he intended to condense in the latter, for the purpose of moral instruction, the sum of his historical knowledge. Evidently, the same circle of ideas, the same cast of thought and mental character lie at the bottom of both these compositions.

It certainly is natural and just to judge respecting the age of literary productions, by a comparison of different periods. If now a competent critic examines the written monuments of the period when Christianity had gained a firm foot-hold, (which are merely some Epistles of Polycarp, Clement, Ignatius of Antioch and Barnabas,) he cannot but see that these compositions, valuable as they certainly are, are far inferior, as to perfect and pure morality and in their general contents, to those ascribed to Paul, Peter and John; that the latter approach nearer to the spirit of Jesus, and hence may more reasonably claim to be assigned to his time.

Take too the oldest religious monument of the Jews, subsequent to the dissolution of their nation, viz. the Mischnah, which was compiled from traditions about the third century, and we find the difference between it and these compositions in respect to the dignity of the contents to be immeasurable. So much had the Jews degenerated, that we must go back with our Epistles to a better age, if the authors of them were men of Jewish origin.

The manner, too, the peculiar treatment of the subjects, the arguments, the style and diction are characteristic of the productions of the time.

We find throughout, the Christian morality and religion, yet inculcated by Jews,—not, however the Jews of the Mischnah, not in a casual manner, in a dry, barbarous Hebrew dialect, in a style devoid of taste and elegance,—but in the Jewish-Greek dialect of those times, (when the Greek had already gained considerable influence, by the side of the native language of the country,) with an attractive but artless eloquence, with an unlabored grace to which nature and the subject, and not the schools, gave rise.

Their language plainly resembles that of Philo, and their style emulates his; with this difference only, that Alexandrine wit, art, and learning, and a diction of a purer character, more free from Hebraism, distinguish Philo above the Jewish writers, who were educated in Palestine, and hence could have no acquaintance with the lecture-rooms of the rhetoricians and sophists, or the precepts of the grammarians. Otherwise, if we except whatever is owing to the place of residence of the Alexandrine Jew, we should, from the striking analogy in language and style, judge them to have been contemporaries of Philo. Let us in idea reverse the country and personal circumstances of each, and then imagine how each would probably have written.

In particular, in modes of reasoning, which deviate from the usual paths of argument, they so much resemble one another, that we might be inclined to suppose them to have belonged not only to the same period, but to the same school, were it not that the learned Alexandrian discovers himself by the immodest freedom of his fancy, and the per-

petual play of his wit. But they perfectly agree in this, that they never appeal to the authority of former expounders of the law, as was afterwards customary with the Jews: they always appeal to natural principles and especially to the holy books of their nation. But besides the literal meaning, they extorted a hidden sense from these books. They affixed a representative character to persons and things, according to which, while they performed the proper functions of their own being, they represented something else *typically*. Or they made narratives of facts of use to morality by *allegorical* and *tropological* applications.

We may be satisfied of this by an example which appears very well suited to show the similarity prevailing between them in respect to singular modes of reasoning. Philo maintains that science and learning are not themselves an ultimate end, but are only subordinate helps to virtue and self-government, to which, as the supreme ultimate end, they conduct. He wishes to prove this from the history of Sarah and Hagar.<sup>1</sup> Sarai, he says, signifies *my government*; and it is virtue only which elevates me to government over myself and to royalty. Hagar is an Egyptian woman; her name signifies *a native*, and as an Egyptian, she represents *learning*: in both ways, therefore, she represents a familiar acquaintance with learning and science. Now Sarah is the wife, while Hagar is only her handmaid. Thus science is only a handmaid and servant, who must be subordinate to virtue, the higher end.

Paul wishes to show the Galatians the superiority of the New over the Old Testament. For this purpose he makes use of an *Allegoroumenon*, as he calls it. Abraham had two sons; one by Sarah, a freewoman, and the other by Hagar, a bondwoman. But *Hagar* represents the law; for it was given on Sinai, in the land of the Hagarenes: and Sarah represents the new covenant, the Gospel; for a son was given to her *διὰ τῆς ἐπαγγελίας*.<sup>2</sup> Now as the relation of the Law to the Gospel is the same as that of the maid to her mistress, the children of the first, the bondwoman, are in bondage, while the children of Sarah, i. e. the children of the promises or of the Gospel, being born of a free mother, are free.

Paul pursues his allegory, and deduces inferences from it in respect to the abolition of Judaism, making such an application of them that he found no difficulty in establishing his position. Thus we are, like Isaac, children of the promises after the spirit, while the offspring of the law are only children after the flesh. But what saith the scripture? Cast out the bondwoman and her son; for he shall not be heir with the son of the freewoman. Now we are not children of the bondwoman, but of the free.

In another place Philo treats this history in nearly the same manner.<sup>3</sup> Sarah, the mistress, bears a son, who receives his name from *laughter*, which is the expression of the joy accompanying virtue. But Hagar, i. e. learning, bears a son, who is a sophist, and knows not the wisdom of virtue. If now learning will not serve virtue, what says the Scrip-

<sup>1</sup> Philo, *De congress. quær. erudit. gratia*.

<sup>2</sup> The original reads *ἐκ τῆς* &c. but a reference to the Gr. Test. will show that it is inaccurate.—Tr.

<sup>3</sup> Philo, *De Cherubim*, at the commencement.

ture? Cast out the bondwoman and her son. Hence sophistical subtilty, which only produces error, must yield to wisdom and virtue.

Numerous other resemblances in particular representations, in the treatment of a subject, in the mode of reasoning and composition, have been discovered by the friends of biblical learning, and have been applied to the elucidation of particular passages in these Epistles; and time and the scrutiny of the learned will bring many more to light.

Since this spirit in the treatment, prosecution and exhibition of a subject was prevalent at only one period, became extinct afterwards and has left not a trace behind in the Talmudists, the critic cannot but assign the origin of these Epistles, so far as he judges from their *manner*, to that age, which has given positive proofs of just such a taste.

### § 6.

We have many remains of ancient literature of whose genuineness we are thoroughly convinced on no other than internal grounds. This is not the case with the writings of the N. T.: there is not even a single one among all the scientific productions of the Greeks and Romans, whose origin and age are attested by so many testimonies, and by writers of such a character, reaching up so nearly to the period to which the work is assigned. If, as is commonly supposed, these writings were composed not long before the dissolution of the Jewish state, or soon afterward, (the earliest of them under Nero, the latest under Domitian) the witnesses, as far down as Diocletian, lived at most not more than 200 years from the close of this period, so that they could not but have possessed the means of determining with certainty in respect to them; and yet their testimony is now scarcely regarded in these investigations.

For the sake of ascertaining how early the N. T. writings were in circulation among the Christians, the works of the oldest Fathers of the Church have been waded through with remarkable patience, and the passages which bear upon this point collected together. A certain Englishman in particular has distinguished himself in this commendable employment. He was soon followed by others, who tested his collection by the most rigid principles and estimated it with critical care.<sup>1</sup>

The results obtained from this collection in favor of the N. T. are well known; I have therefore determined to add to this proof a second, which will remarkably corroborate the other and sometimes surpass it in cogency. The earliest ages of Christianity produced a multitude of sects who attempted to unite their philosophical and theurgical<sup>2</sup> opinions with the Christian system, and often involved themselves in whimsical

<sup>1</sup> Nathaniel Lardner in his "Credibility of the Gospel history confirmed by the testimonies of the Christian Fathers." Chr. Fried. Schmid has freely made use of this collection in the "Historia et vindicatio Canonis." Lips. 1775. Gottfr. Less has amended it in a critical manner in his "Wahrheit der Christlichen Religion, 1768," and in his more complete work "Ueber Religion, ihre Geschichte und Bestätigung," I. Th. II. Abschn. § 29 sq. Paley has at least made a better selection from it in his "Evidences of Christianity," Part. I. c. 9, § 1.

<sup>2</sup> This word Hug has formed from the Greek *θεουργικός*, which signifies respecting God's agency.—Tr.



fancies, in beautiful and often ridiculous dreams. Even these sought to ground their positions upon the authority of the Biblical books, and to defend them against different tenets, especially those of the dominant church. Their writings are indeed mostly lost, and were intentionally destroyed, and we do not thank piety for it; but sometimes zeal in refuting them has saved fragments of their treatises, and their opponents have preserved the arguments which they advanced in support of their opinions. I propose to collect together such passages, which will carry us further back into the antiquity than the writings of the Fathers of the Church who afterwards wrote against them. These present the peculiar advantage of coming from men who had seceded from the adherents to the common system, and broken off all good understanding with them.

I have granted a place here to those witnesses only, who belong to the second century, and have, indeed, admitted none who did not appear till several years after the death of Commodus. They all appeared as teachers under that Emperor or at a still earlier period under the two Antonines, and their youth fell in the days of Hadrian and Ulpian Trajan, under the latter of whom the last of the Apostles finished his earthly course in extreme old age.

### § 7.

Before I approach my proposed task, it is necessary to premise some observations on the practice of the oldest christian writers of every sect in respect to biblical citations, so that we may not make unreasonable requisitions of them, and when these are not satisfied, make inferences which are regarded as principles of sufficient solidity to serve as the foundation of a system.

I. They have always quoted the O. T. more carefully than the New; because they naturally could not suppose all their readers so well acquainted with the former as with the latter. Many of them even seem to have thought it evidence of erudition and literary display, to accumulate in their works passages from the O. T., as, for example, Clement of Rome, Barnabas and Justin. This they have not done as to the New, which was better known.

II. They did not treat the historical and didactic books alike. They have seldom transcribed narrations, either from the O. or N. T., at full length and in the author's words; and who would expect them to do it? But they have given them in their peculiar manner, sometimes remembering the expression of the writer and generally abbreviating it.

In such cases the bare conformity of the fact with one of our Gospels is far from being proof that it was really taken from them. It might have been taken from other historical books; but the circumstances which are mentioned in them depend upon the individual representation of the original author, some of these being selected by one, and others by another, or all being carelessly and summarily presented. Hence they are more definite means of recognizing a writer; and the style and choice of words are still more decisive. Now if we find, in addition to this, plain resemblances in language and instances of a recall

of peculiar expressions, so great coincidence is no longer attributable to chance, and we may with confidence assume that there is a citation of this or that book, with which everything agrees.

III. They have generally cited the didactic writings of the O. T. *verbatim*, and the Prophets particularly with direct reference. This was natural; for who could distinctly recollect passages, so often resembling one another, even if he were ever so familiar with them? Or who would know where to find them, if the name were not given and the expression faithfully preserved?

IV. In respect to the Epistles of the N. T. their practice is similar; they usually cite passages from them accurately. They frequently even refer to their authors by name; particularly when they do not cite the passages in an exactly literal manner.

V. When they quote moral principles and tenets, they often mind only the thought and disregard the words. Thus, e. g. Tatian in his "Oration to the Greeks" maintains the original condition of the human mind to be darkness, and alludes to the Gospel of John: *ἡ ψυχὴ καθ' ἑαυτὸν σκότος ἐστὶ, καὶ οὐδὲν ἐν αὐτῇ φωτεινόν, καὶ τοῦτο ἐστὶν ἄρα εἰρημένον, ἡ σκοτία τὸ φῶς οὐ καταλαμβάνει . . . καὶ τὸ φῶς τὴν σκοτίαν κατέλαβεν. καὶ ὁ λόγος μὲν ἐστὶ φῶς θεοῦ.* Such is his procedure as to another passage which he has taken from the first chapter of John: *θεῶ τῷ μόνῳ κατακολουθήσατε, πάντα ὑπ' αὐτοῦ, καὶ χωρὶς αὐτοῦ γέγονεν οὐδὲ ἓν.* (Or. adv. Græc. c. 13 & 19.) The first thing requisite in order to regard such a passage as a citation, is agreement in the thought. If there is still further a resemblance in the costume and in the words employed, there is stronger reason not to regard it as a merely casual coincidence. Yet even this will not be sufficient, unless such a form of citation, as was customary with the ancients when they referred to passages in the Bible, shows such not very clearly marked passages to be quotations; as, e. g. above, where a biblical sentiment and phraseology is denoted by the formula *καὶ τοῦτο ἐστὶν ἄρα εἰρημένον.*

These forms of citation are various and we shall lay no stress upon any of them before showing, as we will do in respect to the above, that they were used for this purpose by the ancients.

VI. One species of them merits a particular consideration. The ancients have very seldom, when they refer to the sayings and doctrines of Jesus, named the books in which he is represented as thus speaking. They nearly always quote the person speaking and not the narrator. Most of the citations from the Evangelists occur under the formula: "Our Lord says," "Our Saviour declares" &c.; and sometimes perhaps there is added, "in the Gospel." The name of the Evangelist very rarely appears. The writers chose rather to rest their point upon the legislative authority of our Lord, than upon the authority of his biographers.

I have said that most of the citations from the Gospels occur under this formula. This is evident at any rate in Irenæus, a writer of this period, and in the Fathers of the following century. We cannot be wrong, therefore, in inferring that under this formula others referred to *written documents* respecting the life and doctrines of our Lord. If this phrase had not referred to familiar sources and such as were conceded to be authoritative; if it only referred to oral traditions, it would

have been more definitely declared on whose authority an assertion was made.

Now if, under the citation "our Lord declares" &c. the very same idea occurs which is in our scriptures, and with strong similarities in expression, the greater the similarity in expression and the more numerous the possibilities that a difference in words, in their inflexion and arrangement might have taken place, the more clear it is that the passage must have been taken from our books. All doubt, however, ceases, when, besides identity in the ideas, there is also an identity in the words, in cases where deviations were very easy.

VII. But we must not judge of this identity according to the common printed text of the Elzevirs or Stephens; it is not the proper criterion. The text, as we shall see more fully in its history, had, in the second century and in the beginning of the third, many peculiarities in particular copies, (as in the text of Justin, Irenæus, Clemens Alexandrinus and other Fathers) which have been removed by the revisers of the third century. Hence, if we find discrepancies, they need not trouble us except when they do not appear in other writers of the period or in documents which present a very ancient text. If they occur elsewhere, we perceive that such discrepancies are only variations in common MSS. as they were at that time current.

We now approach our proposed task, and shall prosecute it on much more rigid principles than the preliminary observations we have just made require.

### § 8.

#### CELSUS,

A philosopher of the second century, of the Epicurean sect, composed a work against Christianity, to which he gave the title *Ἀληθὴς Λόγος*. Origen in his reply has rescued a considerable part of this work from oblivion.

In it the philosopher relates several circumstances which accompanied Christ's birth: he speaks in general terms of his miracles, says that he healed the lame and blind, and that he raised the dead; that he was declared by a voice from heaven to be the son of God, and, after choosing himself disciples of low rank in life, was betrayed by one of them, condemned to death by the Roman Prætor, was crucified and rose again. The story of the passion and of the resurrection he has treated more in detail and has related, many incidental circumstances, such as, that he prayed the Father that he would take this cup from him (L. II. c. 24); that he drank vinegar and gall, and that blood flowed from his side (L. II. c. 36, 37); that he arose, but that the account of the Christian books as to this matter is contradictory, some pretending that one angel, others that two were seen at his sepulchre (L. V. c. 52); that after this resurrection he showed the prints on his hands, but that he really appeared only to one woman. (L. II. c. 59.)

Moreover the philosopher speaks in various places, (L. VII. c. 18, & 25. VII. 58.) of Christ's doctrine of an universal Providence, which feeds the ravens and clothes the lilies; and likewise in regard to meekness



under injuries, in which he commands to turn the other cheek also. He has criticised in a censorious manner some of our Lord's discourses, e. g., that on the dangers of riches, in which he made use of the comparison of the camel and the needle; or that which asserts that no man can serve two masters; but particularly Christ's prediction that false Christs and Prophets should come after him and should deceive the people by their impostures. (L. VI. c. 16. L. VII. c. 70. L. VIII. c. 2 and 7. L. II. c. 49.)

These accounts, particularly those which relate to the passion, were, Celsus asserts, recorded by Christ's disciples.<sup>1</sup> Soon after he says also: "All this have we taken from your own writings: for, we have no need of any other witnesses, since your own weapons are sufficient to destroy you." (L. II. c. 74.)

We clearly discover our Evangelists in these historical facts, which Celsus has extracted from the books of Christ's disciples; and all that is wanting to give to his testimony all that completeness which we could desire, is, that he should have mentioned the names or the number of the writers.

He has, however, very clearly distinguished two of them. It was his opinion that those who derived the origin of Jesus from the first man, and from the kings of Judah, were too bold; and the carpenter's wife, he further remarks, must have known of what high extraction she was.<sup>2</sup> Two of our Evangelists, it is well known, have introduced genealogical catalogues into their works. One of them carries back his genealogy of our Lord to the first man, while the other enumerates the Jewish kings in their order, and declares them to be Christ's ancestors.

The account, that Jesus showed to his disciples after his resurrection the marks of his crucifixion, the wounds on his hands, (L. II. c. 50)<sup>3</sup> enables us to recognize a third Evangelist, who alone has distinctly represented this circumstance as it occurs in Celsus. (John 20. Compare Luke 24: 39.)

In which of the Gospels, but John's (2: 18) is it recorded that the Jews demanded of our Lord in the temple, ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ, a sign to prove that he was the Son of God?<sup>4</sup>

Where else do we find the assertion that the Logos is the Son of God, λόγον εἶναι υἱὸν τοῦ θεοῦ? to which Celsus, or the Jew, whom he introduces as the accuser of the Christians, objects that he was an impure and unholy Logos, who had been ignominiously treated and executed.<sup>5</sup>

The philosopher had seen at least four such writers; for he says that *some* spoke of only one angel's appearing at the sepulchre, and *others* of

<sup>1</sup> L. II. c. 13, and L. II. c. 16. τοὺς δὲ μαθητὰς, τοὺς κατὰ τὸν Ἰησοῦν ἀναγεγραφέναι περὶ αὐτοῦ τοιαῦτα.

<sup>2</sup> L. II. c. 32. ἀπηνυθαδῆσθαι τοῖς γενεαλογήσαντας ἀπὸ τοῦ πρώτου γενήτορος καὶ τῶν ἐν Ἰουδαίῳ βασιλέων τὸν Ἰησοῦν. καὶ . . . ὅτι οὐκ ἂν ἡ τοῦ τέκτονος γενὴ τηλικούτου γένους τυγχάνουσα ἴγνοεῖ.

<sup>3</sup> L. II. c. 59. καὶ τὰ σημεῖα τῆς κολασέως ἔδειξεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς, καὶ τὰς χεῖρας, ὡς ἦσαν πεπερονημέναι.

<sup>4</sup> L. I. c. 67. p. 382.

<sup>5</sup> L. II. c. 31. p. 413.

two.<sup>1</sup> Of the writers of our books Matthew and Mark speak of one, Luke and John of two.

He also denominates the works of these writers, τὸ εὐαγγέλιον, just as those which have been transmitted to us from our ancestors are entitled. (L. II. c. 27.)

Thus much of the historical books. The critic will observe too in Celsus traces of some of Paul's Epistles (L. V. 64. VI. 12. VIII. 24.); but as he names no written sources, from which he took sentiments which are evidently Paul's, but only treats them generally as Christian opinions, we are not at liberty to presume any thing more than he expresses, or to infer written sources, while he speaks only of opinions and tenets which might have been known from oral information.

#### TATIAN AND JULIUS CASSIAN.

The former was a disciple of Justin Martyr; but his imagination and his melancholy propensity to a very austere life led him into errors and made him the founder of the Encratites. He discarded marriage, and in a treatise of his, *Περὶ τοῦ κατὰ τὸν σωτῆρα καταρτισμοῦ*, fragments of which have been preserved by Clement of Alexandria, he even asserted that it proceeded from Satan. He also condemned the use of wine and meat.

Clement, in the 3d Book of his *Stromata*, 12th chap., gives us his tenets in detail, and undertakes to refute them; the next chapter is devoted to Julius Cassian.

He quotes from the beforementioned book of Tatian, *On the perfection inculcated by our Saviour*, a detached passage, in which he says, "He (viz. Paul, whose name immediately precedes) permits matrimonial separation by mutual consent, for the purpose of prayer. But he permits connubial connexion only because of Satan and incontinency." The passage to which Tatian here refers, τὸν ἀπόστολον ἐξηγούμενος, is 1 Cor. 7: 5. He has given us the purport, which is sufficiently peculiar to be readily recognized; but he has not confined himself to the exact expression: *συμφωνίαν μὲν οὖν ἀρμόζει προσευχῇ . . . πάλιν γὰρ ἐπὶ ταῦτο συγχωρήσας γενέσθαι διὰ τὸν Σατανᾶν καὶ τὴν ἀκρασίαν*. Yet we see he has retained particular words of Paul; those, too, which were of especial importance. We will not examine particularly another sentiment belonging to the Gospels, which he has introduced in this connexion, as to *δύσι κυρίοις δουλεύειν*, because it is presented in a too indefinite manner.

Clement now proceeds: "Tatian concedes that marriage is allowed in the Old Testament, but not in the New; distinguishing between τὸν παλαιὸν ἄνθρωπον καὶ τὸν καινόν." He then advances many arguments against him, intended to overthrow this position, as well as his principles in respect to eating meat and drinking wine; and then continues; "A certain one censures procreation as tending only to decay and death, and perverts the words of our Saviour: *ἐπὶ γῆς μὴ θησανρίξειν, ὅπου σῆς καὶ βρωῶσις ἀφανίζει*, &c." This saying of our Sa-

<sup>1</sup> L. V. c. 52. καὶ μὲν καὶ πρὸς τὸν αὐτοῦ τοῦδε τάφον ἔλθεῖν ἄγγελον, οἱ μὲν εἶνα, οἱ δὲ δύο τοὺς ἀποκρινομένους ταῖς γυναίξιν, ὅτι ἀνέστη.

viour, which is worded in a peculiar manner, we find exactly so in Matt. 6: 19, and in no other of the Evangelists besides. But who is this *certain one*, *τις*, who thus perverts the passage? Is it Tatian, or one of his followers? It is not of much importance, but it is Tatian who is here spoken of. And as he makes his complaint here with the expression *τις: κατατρέχει τις τῆς γενέσεως . . . βιάζεται τις . . .* so he begins his refutation of Tatian in the same way. "Marriage" he there says "is not as *τινές* (some) consider it, an injurious fleshly connexion; I here intend Tatian, who has taken upon himself to maintain this:" *οὐ γὰρ ὡς τινες ἐξηγήσαντο . . . Τατιανὸν οἶμαι, τὸν Σύρον κ. τ. λ.*

Soon afterwards he accuses him and his adherents of misinterpreting the words: *οἱ υἱοὶ τοῦ αἰῶνος ἐκείνου τοῦ περὶ νεκρῶν ἀναστάσεως, οὐ γαμοῦσι, οὐδὲ γαμίζονται.* These are taken from the Evangelists, (Matt. 22: 30. Mark 12: 25. Luke 20: 35,) and most exactly from Luke; yet nothing definite can be inferred from this. Thus, out of the Gospels, only the passage Matt. 6: 19, and the passage from John which we have considered in No. 5 of our preliminary observations, remain to us.

But we ought not to busy ourselves here with particular evidences; we must turn to a great work of Tatian's which promises us a splendid proof of the existence of all the four Gospels. We mean the Book according to the four, *διὰ τεσσάρων*. We shall need to be more circumstantial in relation to this matter than would have been necessary before so much pains had been taken to involve the subject in obscurity.

Ephraem the Syrian composed a commentary on this work, which the Syrian writers sometimes mention and from which they gained their knowledge of the nature of the Diatessaron. Dionysius Bar-Salibi gives us the following account of it: <sup>1</sup> Tatian," says he, "the philosopher and disciple of Justin Martyr, formed of the four Gospels a single one which he called Diatessaron. St. Ephraem composed a commentary on it; it begins, In the beginning was the word, &c."

Eusebius records respecting an offshoot of Tatian's sect, which seceded from it soon after its rise, viz. the Severites, that they received the *Law*, the *Prophets*, and the *Gospels*; but that they reviled *Paul* and rejected the *Acts of the Apostles*. Their former leader, he continues, effected, I know not how, a combination of the Gospels, and called it the

<sup>1</sup> Asseman. Biblioth. Or. T. I. p. 57. T. II. p. 159, 60. But it may be objected that Assemani quotes a passage shortly afterwards (T. I. 57, 58,) from Bar-Hebraeus, which attributes the book, on which Ephraem composed a commentary, to Ammonius; and therefore the matter is uncertain. Not at all. The Monotessaron of Ammonius was most popular among the Greeks; but that of Tatian the Syrian, among the Syrians, in whose churches Theodoret found many copies and carried them away. (Haer. Fab. L. I. c. 20.) On the contrary, the book of Ammonius was so scarce among the Syrians, that Elias of Salama, notwithstanding his researches, could not get a sight of it. Asseman. Bib. Or. T. II. p. 160. The testimony of Bar-Salibi, however, is our chief reliance; it is irrefragable. He wrote annotations on the books of the N. T. and particularly on the Gospels. In the preface he names the writers from whom he compiled his annotations, among whom Ephraem stands first. (Assem. T. II. p. 157, 158.) Now in his preface to Mark, he affirms a second time that Ephraem's commentary was upon Tatian's Monotessaron. (T. I. p. 57.) Hence this Commentary was not known to him merely superficially, or from the report of others, but from constant use; so that he is perfectly qualified to speak decisively respecting it.



(Gospel) by the four, which is still sometimes met with. Thus far the historian.<sup>1</sup>

Now, it is not at all problematical or uncertain, what he intends by the *Law*, *Prophets*, and *Gospels*, or by the expression *the Gospels*, nor what the people of his time, in accordance with whom he speaks, intended by them; and as little, what he meant by *Acts of the Apostles*, and by *Paul*. Thus it is pretty clear of what materials this Diatessaron was composed.

In his account, however, two things must be distinguished; the information itself and its source. He says that Tatian had made a combination of the Gospels, which he called the (Gospels) by the four, which book was yet extant. This is the information. He acknowledges, however, with his wonted historical honesty, that he does not know the mode of procedure which he adopted in this combination. Consequently Eusebius does not pretend to be himself surety for the fact of which he speaks, but only recollects some persons who had the book or had seen it, and from whom he learned the fact.

Thus according to these persons, whose information the historian was disposed to credit, a book of Tatian's was extant in the 4th century, which contained a peculiar combination of the (then so called) Gospels, and bore the name, *διὰ τεσσάρων*.

I know not what more could be desired for a knowledge of the fact or for its attestation, except it be that one who had seen the book himself should have spoken of it directly. We have such a witness, who collected no less than two hundred copies of it.

It will be perceived that I refer to Theodoret, of Cyprus in Syria. This Tatian, says he, compiled the Gospel which is called *by the four*; but he left out the genealogies and other passages which represent our Lord as of the lineage of David according to the flesh.

He characterizes the book in a general way; yet he preserves the *terminus comparationis* in the manner in which he gives his readers to understand its contents, viz. from its agreement or disagreement with something. From what then, did he suppose, that Tatian had taken away the genealogies? From what writings did he mean that he had removed some passages? From what books, with which his readers were acquainted, was the Diatessaron distinguished by these characteristics?

It is by no means difficult to supply the ellipsis. Even if we did not recollect what books, which Theodoret had, contained genealogies, or what the Syrians say of the materials of the Diatessaron, or what Eusebius says in respect to it, we should nevertheless presume that Theodoret means to compare the *Gospel by the four* with the Gospels as they were read by himself and those of his own faith to whom he writes. As this is the whole difficulty and the only one in which his account is involved, we are now under no perplexity as to his meaning.

<sup>2</sup> L. IV. Hist. Eccles. Cap. penult. *χρῶνται μὲν οἷν οἱ τοὶ νόμον, καὶ προφηταῖς, καὶ εὐαγγελίοις, ἰδίως ἐρμηνεύοντες τῶν ἱερῶν τὰ νοήματα γραφῶν. Βλασφημοῦντες δὲ Παῦλον τὸν ἀπόστολον, ἀθετοῦσιν αὐτοῦ τὰς ἐπιστολάς, μηδὲ τὰς πράξεις τῶν ἀποστόλων καταδεχόμενοι. Ὁ μὲν τοι, γὰρ πρότερος αὐτῶν ἀρχηγός, ὁ Τατιανός, συνάγειν τινα καὶ συναναγγέλλειν οὐκ οἶδ' ὅπως τῶν εὐαγγελίων συνθεῖς, τὸ διὰ τεσσάρων τοῦτο προσονόμασεν, ὃ καὶ παρὰ τισιν εἰσέτι νῦν φέρεται.*

The Gospel according to the four was, therefore, a combination of the four Gospels as possessed by Theodoret and his fellow Christians the Catholics; with this difference, that the genealogies of Matthew and Luke were wanting in it, together with some other declarations and expressions, which asserted our Lord to be a descendant of David according to the flesh.

He now proceeds to represent himself as an eye-witness of the fact of which he speaks. This book, says he, has been made use of not only by his (Tatian's) followers; but also by many of the orthodox. I myself found more than *two hundred* of these books in high estimation in our churches, all which I collected and removed, and in their stead introduced the four Gospels.<sup>1</sup>

How literally otherwise this book presented the text of the Gospels, may be inferred from the fact that its authority has been regarded in critical judgment respecting certain various readings. A Scholium to Codex Harleian. 5647. (Wetstein, 72.) on Matt. 27: 49, where in some MSS. (e. g. BCL) after σώσαν αὐτόν, there is this addition: ἄλλος λάβων λόγχην, ἔνυξεν αὐτοῦ τὴν πλευράν, καὶ ἐξῆλθεν ὕδωρ καὶ αἷμα, justifies this reading by Tatian's authority, stating that, τὸ κατ' ἱστορίαν εὐαγγέλιον, the Gospel arranged according to historical order, contained this addition: "Οτι εἰς τὸ κατ' ἱστορίαν εὐαγγέλιον Διοδώρου καὶ Τατιάνου, καὶ ἄλλων διαφόρων ἁγίων πατέρων τοῦτο πρόσκειται, κ. τ. λ.

Julius Cassian's doctrinal opinions closely resembled those of Tatian. Some fragments of one of his works, περὶ ἐγκράτειας, ἢ περὶ εὐνουχίας, are preserved by Clemens Alexandrinus.<sup>2</sup>

He, too, condemned marriage, recommended continence, and maintained that Paul himself ascribes the origin of this connexion to the first temptation. The passage to which he appeals is as follows: ποβοῦμαι δὲ μή, ὡς ὁ ὅστις Εὐὰν ἐξηπάτησεν, σθαρῶν τὰ νοήματα ὑμῶν ἀπο τῆς ἀπλότητος τῆς εἰς τὸν Χριστόν.<sup>3</sup> This is almost word for word in the 2d Epistle to the Corinthians, (11: 3.) He judged the act of procreation to be fitting only for worldly men, and not to be consonant with the elevated dispositions of Christians. To fortify his position he quotes the passage: ἡμῶν δὲ τὸ πολίτευμα ἐν οὐρανῷ, ἐξ οὗ καὶ σωτήρα ἀπεδεχόμεθα. The passage is the same as Philipp. 3: 20, except that he has omitted the word ὑπάρχει. We do not discover from the fragment, as it is thrown out in a detached way in Clement, to what writer Cassian ascribed this sentiment. Yet, from the succeeding expressions of Clement we may infer that he must have attributed it to Paul; for he proceeds, αὐθις τέ, ὅταν ἔγῃ—and again when he

<sup>1</sup> Theodoret Haeret. Fab. L. I. c. 20. Οἷτος (ὁ Τατιανος) καὶ τὸ διὰ τεσσάρων καλούμενον συντέθεικεν εὐαγγέλιον, καὶ τὰς γενεαλογίας περικόψας, καὶ τὰ ἄλλα, ὅσα ἐκ σπέρματος Δαβὶδ κατὰ σάρκα γεγενημένον τὸν Κίριον δείκνυσιν . . . εὐρον δὲ καὶ γὰρ πλείους ἢ διακόσιαι βίβλους τοιαύτας ἐν ταῖς παρ' ἡμῶν ἐκκλησίαις τετιμημένας, καὶ πάσας συναγάγων ἀπεθέμην καὶ τὰ τῶν τεσσάρων εὐαγγελίων ἀντιστήγαγον εὐαγγέλιον.

<sup>2</sup> Lib. III. Strom. c. 13, 14, 15. Ed. Ven. Tom. I. Opp. p. 552—54. Sylburg. p. 465, seq. He mentions also a first book τῶν ἐξηγητικῶν by him. L. I. Strom. c. 21.

<sup>3</sup> L. III. Strom. c. 14.

says—and then adduces a passage from Paul in confutation of him.<sup>1</sup> So, likewise, according to Jerome's testimony, he perverted the words of Paul in Galat. 6: 8, *quoniam qui seminat in carne sua*, &c. as far as *vitam aeternam*, so as to make them discountenance matrimonial connexion.<sup>2</sup>

Thus, besides particular testimonies to the Gospels of Matthew and John, we have proof from Tatian's Diatessaron of the existence of all the four Gospels, the genealogies excepted, together with some passages respecting the human origin of our Lord; and likewise of that of the 1st Epistle to the Corinthians under Paul's name. Cassian proves the existence of the 2d Epistle to the Corinthians, by express reference to it, and also, as it would seem, that of the Epistles to the Galatians and Philipians in the same manner.

### THEODOTUS.

At the end of the works of Clemens Alexandrinus there is a treatise entitled: *ἐκ τῶν Θεοδοτίου καὶ τῆς ἀνατολικῆς καλουμένης διδασκαλίας κατὰ τοὺς Οὐαλεντίνου χρόνους ἐπιτομαί*. It sheltered itself from the ravages of time in the manuscripts containing the writings of this Father and was regarded as his own composition. To this circumstance it probably owes its preservation.<sup>3</sup>

If this were in fact a production of Clement's, we should certainly be obliged to him for the pains taken in it to make extracts from the works of Theodotus; but I regard it as the work of a follower of Theodotus, who was desirous of making some *Excerpta* from the writings of his master, and selected those passages especially, in which Theodotus compared his system with that of the Valentinians.

He therefore commences a parallel (§ 2.) between the doctrines of Valentinus and those of Theodotus, unfolding the ideas of the former respecting the Logos, as *monogenes*, *protogenes*, &c. as far as § 8. We, however, *ἡμεῖς δέ*, he says on the other hand, maintain that the Logos was in reality a God in God; that he existed in the bosom, i. e. in the idea, of the Father, and that this bosom first revealed the *σωτήρ*, Saviour. Out of this idea originally proceeded *δι' ἐνέργειαν* the *πρωτότοκος* or first-born and the *Monogenes* or only-begotten, who is identical with the former and through whose power the *σωτήρ* is efficacious. Further, faith is not one, but manifold, as, even in the spiritual world,

<sup>1</sup> L. III. Strom. c. 14 and 15.

<sup>2</sup> Hieronym. Comment. in Ep. ad Gal. L. III. c. 6. v. 8. *Quoniam qui seminat . . . vitam aeternam*. Cassianus, (some read Tatianus) qui putativam Christi carnem introducens omnem conjunctionem masculi ad foeminam immundam arbitratur, Encratitarum vel acerrimus heresiarches, tali adversum nos sub occasione presentis testimonii usus est argumento, si quis seminat in carne, de carne metet corruptionem.

<sup>3</sup> This Treatise appeared in the first Greek edition of this Father, at Florence, 1550. fol., and was reprinted in the subsequent editions; but was first translated by the Dominican Combefis. The translation with the Greek text was afterwards incorporated by Fabricius into his *Biblioth. Graeca*, Vol. V. The translator, who was otherwise a learned man, appears sometimes to have been wanting in the knowledge of facts necessary to this difficult task.



there are not the same bodies, and therefore not the same perceptions. For spirits, even the Protoktistae and indeed the Monogenes himself, are not wholly without form and body, etc. (§ 8, 9.)

From the moment, when the writer begins to communicate his opinions, *ἡμεῖς δέ*, but *we*—from § 8 to § 17 and even farther, it is evident that he belongs to a sect of the Gnostics.

After detailing the explanation of the incarnation given by the Valentinians, as asserting a mingling of two different spiritual beings into unity, he very sensibly remarks against it, *ἐμοὶ δὲ δοκεῖ*—that spiritual beings unite not in essence, but in the developement of power; they do not flow into one another, but they exist with one another. (§ 17.) It may hence be inferred how he imagined the union of God with man to have taken place. This too explains in a measure the 8th section. He then closes this part of the discussion with an exposition of the 110th Ps. v. 3. to which he adds, *ἡμεῖς οὕτως ἐξακούομεν*. (§ 20.)

As he shows himself throughout a determined Gnostic, so he is as determined an enemy of the Valentinians while exhibiting the tenets of Theodotus.

In criticising the Valentinians, he uses, (§ 24.) the harsh expression, *ἀγνοοῦσι*, and (§ 30.) he even calls their belief atheistical, *λέγουσιν ἀθέως*, and shows, on the other hand, how correct was the opinion of Theodotus on this point. To understand this passage, it is necessary to read, as Sylburg has proposed, *οὐ γὰρ συνεπάθησεν ὁ πατήρ*.

Strongly as he declares himself in favor of this teacher, he yet dissents (§ 33.) from his opinion; but says here, *our* Theodotus, thus again designating the sect to which he adheres. The manner, too, in which he dissents from him is so mild, that we cannot but perceive his respect: *ἐστὶν οὖν ὁ λόγος οὗτος παράκουσμα τοῦ ἡμέτερον*—this was a misapprehension of our master's, or, he was wrongly informed.

This obscure, and on many accounts difficult work, is therefore the composition of a Gnostic, and a Theodotian, expressly written in opposition to the system of Valentinus. As to its plan, it contains only aphorisms from a larger Gnostic work. Hence the title pretty correctly expresses its character: "Extracts from the writings of Theodotus against Valentinus:" only, it strikes me, we should read, *Οὐαλεντίνου κοινωνοῦς*, instead of *κατὰ τοὺς Οὐαλεντίνου χρόνους*. Theodotus can hardly have lived in the days of Valentinus, in which case only could *χρόνους* have any sense. Others have proposed the word *αἰῶνας* instead.

So far we have been preparing the way; and now we may avail ourselves of any advantage which we can derive from this work.

In order to establish a distinction between celestial natures and to make out different classes in the spiritual world, Theodotus maintains that no being of the seven orders of spirits possesses so exalted attributes as the Son. Hence he remarks, *καὶ ὁ μὲν φῶς ἀπρόσιτον εἴρηται . . . ἃ ὁ φθαλμὸς οὐκ εἶδε, καὶ οὐς οὐκ ἤκουσεν, οὐδὲ ἐπὶ καρδίαν ἀνθρώπου ἀνέβη*.<sup>1</sup> The first part of the passage appears to allude to the words 1 Tim. 6: 16, *ὁ μόνος . . . φῶς οὐκ ὄντων ἀπρόσιτον*, and the last is found literally in 1 Cor. 2: 9. True, he does not mention the author,

<sup>1</sup> § 10. p. 970. Ven. Edit. and Ed. Sylburg, p. 790.

and says nothing, moreover, of the sacred books from which he borrowed the ideas ; but he uses the expression *εἴρηται*, a formula which he employs only when quoting something out of the Old or New Testament, (e. g. § 54. or § 19. § 42.) as Tatian, likewise, used it in such a case.

These various spirits owe their distinction, in part, to the finer or coarser bodies with which they are enveloped. For even the *ψυχαί*, *animæ*, (permit me to retain this phraseology,) have a *corpus animale*, whence the Apostle says: *ὁ γοῦν ἀπόστολος, σπεύρεται μὲν γὰρ σῶμα ψυχικόν, ἐγείρεται σῶμα πνευματικόν*. A little further on he quotes the words, *ὡς δὲ ἐφορέσαμεν τὴν εἰκόνα τοῦ χοῦ, φορέσωμεν καὶ τὴν εἰκόνα τοῦ ἐπουρανίου*, and remarks on them, *πλὴν πάλιν εἰκόνα λέγει, but he here calls it again an image*. A little after he observes, *καὶ πάλιν, and again, ἄρτι βλέπομεν δι' ἐσόπτρου ἐν αἰνίγματι, τότε δὲ πρόσωπον πρὸς πρόσωπον*. (§ 14. § 15.) These repetitions (*and again, and again*) must, from the nature of the case, refer to the first citation, *ὁ Ἀπόστολος, the Apostle says*. And the three passages quoted are really found in this Apostle's 1st Epistle to the Corinthians (15: 44. 15: 49. and 13: 12.) Also (in § 22.) the words *καὶ ὅταν εἴπῃ ὁ Ἀπόστολος, ἐπεὶ τί ποιήσουσιν οἱ βαπτιζόμενοι ὑπὲρ τῶν νεκρῶν*, are the Apostle's, (see 1 Cor. 15: 29.) and § 44. he names the Apostle: *Paul*, says he, *commands, Ὁ Παῦλος κελεύει τὰς γυναῖκας φέρειν ἐξουσίαν ἐπὶ τῆς κεφαλῆς, διὰ τοὺς ἀγγέλους*. He substitutes *φέρειν* for *εἶναι*; otherwise the passage is exactly so in 1 Cor. 11: 10.

As spirits differ in substance, so do they also in intelligence. The Protokistæ, archangels, and angels differ in their degrees of knowledge. This he proves thus: *Εἰς ἃ ἐπιθυμοῦσιν ἄγγελοι παρακλῆσαι, ὁ Πέτρος φησὶν*, and further, *κατὰ τὸν ἀπόστολον, τιμὴ καὶ ἀμῶν καὶ ἀσπίλων αἵματι ἐλουρώθημεν*. (§ 12.) He refers to *Peter*, and we find the passage in 1 Peter 1: 12. He then says, according to *the Apostle*, etc., and the passage cited is 1 Peter 1: 19, with a slight variation, yet expressed so as to be easily and undoubtingly recognized.

He claims *Paul's* authority for a similar Gnostic dogma, which we have neither time nor space here to consider at length: *καὶ ὁ Παῦλος, ἐνδύσαι τὸν καινὸν ἄνθρωπον, τὸν κατὰ θεὸν κτισθέντα*. This he still more explicitly asserts elsewhere: *καὶ ἐτι σαφέστερον καὶ διαρρήδην ἐν ἄλλοις λέγει: ὅς ἐστιν εἰκὼν τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ἀοράτου, εἴτα ἐπιφέρει πρωτότοκος πάσης κτίσεως*. Hence, he concludes, it is also said by him: *ὅθεν καὶ μορφὴν δούλου λαβεῖν εἴρηται*. (§ 19.) The two first passages are in Paul to the Eph. 4: 24, and Coloss. 1: 15; the last is cited only under the formula *εἴρηται*, and consists of only a few words, yet we can recognize Philipp. 2: 7.

After the separation of the elements, the Demiurgus created the orders of evil spirits out of the coarse material belonging to *λύπη*, the mother of evil in the world; and to this the Apostle alludes, when he says: *διὸ καὶ λέγει ὁ Ἀπόστολος, καὶ μὴ λυπεῖτε τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον τοῦ θεοῦ, ἐν ᾧ ἐσφραγίσθητε*. This Paul says in Eph. 4: 30.

In many things the Demiurgus succeeded but imperfectly, mostly from want of skill, having left nature to herself, because he knew not how to guide her. This the Apostle asserts: *διὰ τοῦτο εἶπεν ὁ Ἀπόστολος, ὑπετάγη τῇ ματαιότητι τοῦ κόσμου οὐχ ἑκὼν, ἀλλὰ διὰ τὸν*

ὑποτάξαντα ἐπ' ἐλπίδι, ὅτι καὶ αὐτὸς ἐλευθερωθήσεται. (§ 49.) This is quoted with some small variations, loosely and probably from memory; but is undoubtedly taken from Rom. 8: 20, 21.

Hence comes that strife in creation, of which *Paul* speaks: εἶπεν καὶ ὁ Παῦλος, νόμον ἀντιστρατεύμενον τῷ νόμῳ τοῦ νοῦς μου. (§ 52.) Paul speaks thus in Rom. 7: 23.

But Adam, besides what he received in common with every creature, received through the angels the seeds of a better wisdom. Hence, the writer continues, hence *he says*, (φησί). This expression can refer only to the author previously quoted, viz. Paul. The words which he connects with this form of citation are: διαταγείς, φησι, δι' ἀγγέλων ἐν χειρὶ μεσίτου· ὁ δὲ μεσίτης ἐνὸς οὐκ ἔστιν, ὁ δὲ θεὸς εἷς ἔστιν. (§ 53.) They are found precisely so in the Epistle to the Galatians, 3: 19, 20.

Jesus, in order to meliorate the world's condition, laid aside the πλήρωμα: this is opposed to the κενόν, as the *Apostle* says, ὡς λέγει ὁ Ἀπόστολος, ἑαυτὸν κενώσας. (§ 35.) This expression is found in Philipp. 2: 7. The rest of this passage, Theodotus has made use of in another place, as we have already remarked, ὅθεν καὶ μορφὴν δούλου λαβεῖν εἴρηται. (§ 19.)

From this Epistle, too, without express reference to a biblical book, yet in connexion with other passages borrowed from Paul, viz. Coloss. 1: 16 and Eph. 4: 9, 10, he has quoted, though with considerable freedom, the following passage: διὸ καὶ ὁ θεὸς αὐτὸν ὑπερύψωσεν, καὶ ἔδωκεν αὐτῷ ὄνομα τὸ ὑπὲρ πᾶν ὄνομα, ἵνα πᾶν γόνυ κάμψῃ, καὶ πᾶσα γλῶσσα ἐξομολογήσῃται ὅτι κύριος τῆς δόξης Ἰησοῦς Χριστός. (§ 43. and Philipp. 2: 9, 10, 11.)

The epitomist of Theodotus, in various places, has referred to parables of our Saviour; but so slightly and hastily, that we readily perceive him to suppose all to be perfectly familiar to his readers. In a similar way he treats historical narratives respecting our Saviour. We do indeed find all these things in our gospels; but as they do not retain in the manner of expression any particular reference to our books, it would be too hasty to conclude that they must have been derived directly from them.

Thus he refers to a discourse of our Saviour, σωτήρ φησι, in which he speaks of one who had come back from a journey, after having wasted all his substance, and at whose return a fatted calf was killed. Compare Luke 15: 11—23. And of a king who prepared a marriage supper and invited people to it from the highways. Matt. 22: 2—9. Luke 14: 16—23. (§ 9.) The narrative most resembles that of Matthew, for he calls him a βασιλεὺς and his feast δεῖπνον τοῦ γάμου, which does not agree with Luke. He also mentions a story of Lazarus and a rich man, from which he argues that, even after the present life, we shall have bodies and limbs. (§ 14. Comp. Luke 16: 19 seq.) Also an exhortation of our Saviour, παραινεῖ ὁ σωτήρ, in which he speaks of first binding the strong man and taking possession of his armor. (§ 52.) Comp. Matt. 12: 29. Mark 3: 27. Luke 11: 22. The language accords most nearly with the first two. And also (§ 86.) of virgins, some of whom were wise, παρθένοι φρόνιμοι, but others foolish, who hence were not admitted. (Matt. 25: 1, seq.) etc.



Historical occurrences, too, he has treated in the same cursory manner. E. g. The arrival of the Magi, who saw our Lord's star, and thence knew that a king was born. (§ 75.) And how a coin was brought to our Lord and he asked: *τίνος ἡ εἰκὼν καὶ ἡ ἐπιγραφή*, (§ 86.) which agrees with Matt. 22: 20. Mark 12: 15; and less with Luke 20: 24. And how he was transfigured on the mount before Peter, James and John, and they heard a voice from heaven. (§ 4. 5.)

In relating this last occurrence, Matthew uses the following comparison, (17: 2.) *καὶ ἔλαμψε τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ ὡς ὁ ἥλιος, καὶ τὰ ἱμάτια αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο λευκά ὡς τὸ γῶς*, which occurs neither in Mark 9: 3. nor Luke 9: 28. This comparison Theodotus, in remarking how difficult it is to look upon the Son of God, connects with a biblical quotation, which he ascribes to an Apostle: *κατὰ τὸν Ἀπόστολον*. This quotation is from 1 Peter 1: 19, and with it he immediately connects *οὐ μὲν τὰ ἱμάτια ὡς γῶς ἔλαμψεν, τὸ πρόσωπον δὲ ὡς ὁ ἥλιος*. (§ 12.) This closely resembles Matthew, both as to the idea and the language; particularly, as in some manuscripts of the Evangelist the word *ἐγένετο* is wanting.

He frequently quotes loosely from memory, or interweaves the words of the writer with his own. Thus (§ 51.) the Savior says, *ὁ σωτήρ λέγει—φοβεῖσθαι δεῖν τὸν δυνάμενον ταύτην τὴν ψυχὴν, καὶ τοῦτο τὸ σῶμα ψυχικὸν ἐν γεννῇ ἀπολέσαι*. This is, in substance and in part literally, Matt. 10: 28. He quotes it too in another place (§ 14.) *φοβήθητε (γοῦν λέγει) τὸν μετὰ θάνατον δυνάμενον καὶ ψυχὴν καὶ σῶμα εἰς γενναν ἐμβαλεῖν*. If we may argue from the first quotation to this, it is certainly from Matthew. For he here says: *γοῦν λέγει—therefore he says*, and to whom does this refer? Immediately before, he uses the expression, *ὁ γοῦν Ἀπόστολος, therefore says the Apostle*, and after he has finished the quotation and his inference, he proceeds, *therefore he says*, etc. Hence it is the Apostle who speaks thus.

With the phrase, *ὅταν οὖν εἶπῃ ὁ κύριος*, he connects the following passages: *Μὴ καταφρονήσητε ἐνός τῶν μικρῶν τούτων· ἀμὴν, λέγω ὑμῖν, τούτων οἱ ἄγγελοι τὸ πρόσωπον τοῦ πατρὸς διὰ παντὸς βλέπουσι*, and *Μακάριοι οἱ καθαροὶ τῇ καρδίᾳ, ὅτι αὐτοὶ θεὸν ὁρνοῦται*. (§ 11.) The first of these passages is literally, except a slight transposition, Matt. 18: 10. The *ἐν οὐρανοῖς* after *ἄγγελοι αὐτῶν* is wanting, as here, in all the ancient fathers and versions, and in some MSS. The other passage is literally, Matt. 5: 8.

After his baptism our Lord went into the wilderness, where he was among wild beasts and was attended by angels. (§ 85.) This circumstance that he lived *μετὰ θηρίων*, among wild beasts, or, if you please, this figure with which he adorns the picture of the wilderness, is found only in Mark 1: 13; that he was attended by angels is stated in Mark and Matthew only.

Our Lord brought peace upon earth as says the Apostle, *ὥς φησιν ὁ Ἀπόστολος*. (§ 73.) This Apostle is Luke; for in his Gospel we find the words, *εἰρήνη ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, καὶ δόξα ἐν ὑψίστοις*. 2: 14.

The quotation: *τὸ πνεῦμα ἅγιον ἐπελεύσεται ἐπὶ σέ· (τὴν τοῦ σώματος τοῦ κυρίου λέγει . . . μόρφωσιν) δυνάμεις δὲ ὑψίστου ἐπισκιάσει σοι*, (§ 60.) agrees literally with Luke 1: 35. We perceive from the parenthesis: *He is speaking* etc., that he is quoting some writer: yet we

cannot deduce his name or character, either from what precedes or what follows.

The Savior says, ὁ σωτὴρ λέγει, λαμψάτω τὸ φῶς ὑμῶν· these few words we find in Matt. 5: 16. Theodotus then proceeds: of whom *the Apostle* says, περὶ οὗ ὁ Ἀπόστολος λέγει, ὁ φωτίζει πάντα ἄνθρωπον ἐρχόμενον εἰς τὸν κόσμον. (§ 42.) This is in the Gospel of John, 1: 9. Ὁ δὲ ἄστος ὃν ἐγὼ δῶσω, φησὶν, ἡ σὰρξ μου ἐστίν, (§ 13.) is from the same: John 6: 51. The word φησὶν, *he says*, refers to the Son, of whom he has been speaking. Again, (§ 18.) the Savior says, Ἀβραάμ ἠγαλλιάσατο ἵνα ἴδῃ, τὴν ἡμέραν τὴν ἐμὴν, exactly as in John 8: 56. It is also said, εἰρηται, ἐν ἀρχῇ ὁ λόγος, καὶ ὁ λόγος ἦν πρὸς τὸν θεόν, and ὁ γέγονεν, ἐν αὐτῷ ζωὴ ἐστίν. (§ 19.) John 1: 1 and 4. The Cambridge MS. D. and some in Origen read ζωὴ ἐστίν, as with Theodotus.

Besides this tract, in which a follower of Theodotus has presented us an epitome of one of his master's works, we have also in Epiphanius accounts of Theodotus, his tenets, and the arguments on which he based them. These are indeed stated with considerable heat, but yet are, he asserts, drawn from his writings: τὰ δὲ εἰς ἡμᾶς ἀπὸ συγγραμμάτων ἐλθόντα ἔρουμεν.

This Father of the Church has most assiduously represented certain arguments which the heretic borrowed from the Old and New Testaments, to prove that Jesus was only a man, in whom dwelt an Aeon of a high order. Among these, the interpretation which he gave to the passage Luke 1: 35, seems to me striking. He insists upon the expression ἐπὶ σέ, remarking that, if the tenet of those called Orthodox were intended to be affirmed by it, it would have been: πνεῦμα κυρίου γενήσεται ἐν σοί.<sup>1</sup> The epitomist of Theodotus, too, as we have before seen, (§ 60.) explained these words to express nothing more than God's formation of the human body which he afterwards inhabited. In the epitome, a form of citation is used, viz. λέγει, which, however, does not determine who says it. In Epiphanius even this is wanting.

He then gives us another of the Heretic's arguments. *The Apostles*, says Theodotus, called him only a man accredited by signs and wonders, ἀλλὰ, φησιν, εἶπον οἱ Ἀπόστολοι . . . The words which he quotes are in Acts 2: 22. True, he does not say, the Acts of the Apostles called him a man, etc. but οἱ Ἀπόστολοι. But that the Acts of the Apostles is meant by this form of citation, we learn from Epiphanius, who again cites it exactly in the same way in reply: The same apostles relate in the Acts, that the blessed Stephen said, etc. πάλιν οἱ αὐτοὶ ἀπόστολοι ἐν ταῖς πράξεσιν ἔφησαν, ὡς ὁ μακάριος Στέφανός φησιν, ἰδοὺ ὁρῶ . . . Acts 7: 56. Besides, Peter only is speaking in Acts 2: 22—the expression οἱ Ἀπόστολοι does not apply to him; hence it must refer to the book in which this is related.

Another reason for his opinion he believed he had found in the Epistles. *The Apostle*, he says, calls Jesus a Mediator between God and men: πάλιν δὲ προφασίζεται λέγων, ὅτι ἔφη περὶ αὐτοῦ ὁ Ἀπόστολος, ὅτι μεσίτης θεοῦ καὶ ἀνθρώπων, ἄνθρωπος Χριστὸς Ἰησοῦς, λ. These words are in 1 Tim. 2: 5.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Tom. I. Opp. Edit. juxta Petav. Coloniens. L. II. Haer. LIV. p. 465. Edit. Basileens. p. 202.

<sup>2</sup> Loc. c. p. 467.

He seeks to confirm this further from John 8: 40, where our Lord himself says : ὅτι, φησὶν, ὁ κύριος ἔφη· νῦν δὲ ζητεῖτέ, λ.<sup>1</sup>

That it is possible to apostatise from Christianity he proves from Matt. 12: 31. αὐτοῦ, φησι, τοῦ Χριστοῦ εἰπόντος, πᾶσα βλασφημία, λ.<sup>2</sup>

Before we part with Theodotus we will enumerate together once more the books to which he affords testimony. Of Paul's Epistles, are quoted under the formula *ἔρχεται*, 1 Corinthians, Philippians and the 1st to Timothy; and under the designation, *the Apostle*, or with the name of Paul, Romans, 1 Corinthians, Galatians, Ephesians, Philippians, Colossians.

The 1st of Peter, once mentioning his name, and once under the epithet, *the Apostle*.

He has shortly and summarily referred to several of our Lord's parables, and to historical narratives, which we find in the four Evangelists. Also to some of our Lord's sayings, in substance or literally as we find them in Matthew, Luke and John. He relates Christ's abode in the wilderness after his baptism, in a merely general manner, but yet with a circumstance which is recorded only in Mark. He cites Matthew and John once, and also Luke's Gospel once, prefixing, *the Apostle says*.

In the extracts given by Epiphanius, he appeals to a passage in Matthew, one in Luke, and one in John; under the designation οἱ Ἀπόστολοι, to the Acts of the Apostles, and lastly, with the words, ὁ Ἀπόστολος, to the first Epistle to Timothy.

#### CERTAIN ANONYMOUS HERETICS.

The Heretics of whom we are about to speak belong to the second century, and are mentioned by Tertullian and Origen. Nothing is known of their names and as little of their writings.

Tertullian says that some maintained an exoteric and an esoteric doctrine in Christianity and pretended that the Apostles communicated to their confidential disciples, besides the common doctrine, one more abstruse, and granted them a peculiar and profound insight into it. They drew their proof of this, he says, from Paul, who wrote to Timothy: Keep that which is committed to thy trust," and "O Timothy, that good thing which was committed unto thee keep;" and also, "What thou hast heard, commit thou to faithful men, who shall be able to teach others also."<sup>3</sup> These passages are in 1 Tim. 6: 20, and 2 Tim. 1: 14. 2: 2.

The position of these Heretics and the arguments they adduced in its favor, are not indeed known to us from their own account, but yet they rest on a historical basis, on the information of Tertullian, who confutes them with much earnestness. Probably it was the Carpocratians

<sup>1</sup> Loc. c. p. 463.

<sup>2</sup> L. c. p. 464.

<sup>3</sup> De Praescriptione c. 25. Confitentur quidem, nil apostolos ignorasse, nec diversa inter se predicasse, non tamen volunt illos omnia omnibus revelasse: quaedam enim palam et universis, quaedam secreto et paucis demandasse. Quia et hoc verbo usus est Paulus ad Timotheum: O! Timothee, depositum custodi; et rursum: bonum depositum serva.—Sed nec quia voluit, illum haec fidelibus hominibus demandare, qui idonei sunt, alios docere, id quodque argumentum occulti alicujus evangelii interpretandum est, etc.



against whom the Father grew so warm; for the opinion mentioned was a tenet of their sect.<sup>1</sup>

So with a similar account given by Origen, who complains that some had fallen upon false interpretations through ignorance of the logical rules of exposition. He then proceeds: Among these are to be reckoned such as have wandered into abominable doctrines respecting the Creator of the world, from John's words, I. Ep. V. 19: *The world lieth in wickedness*.<sup>2</sup> It is known that the Gnostic school, generally, regarded the Demiurgus as a very imperfect spirit, who did not completely understand his work and therefore brought evil into creation. Now, although we are not informed what Gnostic sect was particularly pleased with this argument, yet it is certain that the 1st. Epistle of John must have been in existence when such doctrines were built upon it.

### MARCION.

Marcion was scandalized by the many Jewish notions with which Christianity was combined on its appearance, and which his age, probably, knew not always how to distinguish rightly from the substance, as mere vehicles and auxiliary ideas. This Judaism in the Christian system, so offensive in his sight, he determined to destroy. He undertook to do so in a work which he called *Antitheses*, which was noted among the ancients and was revered as a symbolical<sup>3</sup> book by his followers. In this he showed that Christ's moral views were directly contrary to those of the O. T.; and thence infers that the Jewish God, who is also the Creator of the world, is by no means to be confounded with the nobler Deity whom Jesus proclaimed and whose Son he was.

Although he evinces much more intellect than most of the heretics of those days, he was yet not original in this opinion. Cerdo preceded him in this, as in his tenets generally; having at an earlier period asserted this contrariety between the two Testaments.<sup>4</sup> Some of his antitheses are still to be seen in Theodoret,<sup>5</sup> and if this latter writer had been more copious, instead of epitomizing others, his account of Cerdo would have been of great value, and would have furnished us some fine arguments for the Gospels.

It would appear that Marcion went beyond his master in this matter, since he not only maintained a contrariety between the two Testaments, but even assumed a contrariety between the Apostles in the

<sup>1</sup> Irenaeus, L. I. Adv. Haeres. c. 25. n. 5.

<sup>2</sup> Origenes, Tom. II. Opp. p. 23. Ed. De la Rue. Comment. in Genes. In the Ed. Colon. Tom. I. p. 16. Reprint of Huetius: *Οίτε παρά τὸ ἀγνοεῖσθαι τὴν ὁμώνυμον τῆς κόσμου προσηγορίας φωνήν, ἐκπεπτώκασιν ἐπὶ τὰ ἀσεβέστατα φρονεῖν περὶ τοῦ δημιουργοῦ, οἱ μὴ καθάραντες, ἐπὶ τίνων κείται τὸ, ὁ κόσμος ἐν πονερῷ κεῖται, ὅτι ἀντὶ τῶν περιγέμων καὶ ἀνθρωπίνων τοῦτο οὕτως ἐκεί τῷ Ἰωάννῃ εἰρηται. οἰηθέντες γὰρ κόσμον κατ' αὐτὴν τὴν λέξιν σημαίνεισθαι τὸ σύστημα τὸ ἐξ οὐρανοῦ καὶ γῆς καὶ τῶν ἐν αὐτοῖς, θρασύτερα καὶ ἀνοσιώτατα ἀποφαίνονται περὶ θεοῦ.*

<sup>3</sup> This word is derived from the Latin *symbolum*, in the sense of *confession of faith*. TR.

<sup>4</sup> Irenaeus. L. II. Adv. Haeres. c. 27. Tertullianus passim. Epiphanius. Haer. XLII.

<sup>5</sup> Theodoret. Haeret. Fab. L. I. c. 24.

New. He found one proof of this in the Epistle to the Galatians, and accused Peter and his companions of Judaism.<sup>1</sup>

Relying upon this contrariety, he charged a Jewish bias upon the writings of all the Apostles, with the exception of Paul, who has declared the abolition of Judaism without indulgence. For the same reason, as the ancients unanimously assert, he received of the four Gospels only that of Luke, who, as Paul's friend, was least suspected of a Jewish mode of thinking. But as even this did not wholly please him, he struck out particular offensive passages and even whole paragraphs. It has become a serious question, what idea we are to form of this book : as such we will now treat it with the aid of preceding works which richly merit our thanks.<sup>2</sup>

Epiphanius compared the Gospel of Marcion throughout with that of John ; for, before he wrote the books against Heresies, he undertook to oppose this false teacher in a separate work. For this purpose he was obliged to select from the Marcionite Gospel such sections or such particular passages and such altered readings as would serve to convict Marcion of error, out of the sacred books which he acknowledged, and so far as he acknowledged them ; and further to note the sections or passages which he had extolled, in order to prove from his system or on other grounds that he had shown himself an unskilful critic.

The sections, passages and variations noted follow one another in the order in which they occur in Marcion's Gospel ; but the rejected passages, as they should occur in it when compared with our Luke. He has designated them by numbers, and presented 75 chapters, *κεφάλαια*. These he re-wrote and accompanied with short notes, Scholia, in order to assist the memory, *ὑπομνηματικὴ σύνταξις*, and that he might have a foundation, *ἔδαφος*, on which to rear his intended work against Marcion. As he meanwhile dropped this latter intention, he enriched his books against Heresies with this preparatory labor.<sup>3</sup>

It is evident that he has not transcribed at length the parts of Marcion's Gospel which he found to agree with that of Luke, but has presented them only in a condensed way, that they might be more easily inspected ; merely stating their agreement, and sometimes only selecting from them such particular passages as seemed to him adapted to be used against the Heretic.

A celebrated man has taken these condensed statements and allusions to be the actual text of Luke according to Marcion, and discovers in them another branch of the original Gospel for Christians not Jew-

<sup>1</sup> Tertullian. L. I. Adv. Marcion. c. 20. L. IV. c. 3. L. V. c. 2.

<sup>2</sup> Eichhorn's position has given rise to three very good works, by means of which we have won firm footing on contested ground. Mich. Arneht. "Ueber die Bekanntschaft Marcions mit unserm Canon des N. T. und insbesondere über das Evangelium desselben." Linz. 1809. 4.—The following books have conducted us still farther. Aug. Hahn, "Das Evangelium Marcions in seiner ursprünglichen Gestalt—nebst dem Beweise—dass es ein verstümmeltes und verfälschtes Lukas-Evangelium war," etc. Königsberg 1823.—Hermann Olshausen, "Die Echtheit der vier canonischen Evangelien aus der Geschichte der zwey ersten Jahrhunderte erwiesen." Königsberg 1823. The dissertation on Marcion is a very able part of this work.

<sup>3</sup> Epiphani. Haeres. XLII. §. 11. 12.

ish, as he considers the Gospel καὶ Ἐβραίων as the original Gospel which extended itself among the Jewish Christians. The brevity of the Marcionite Luke, as it appears upon this supposition, was to the celebrated Eichhorn the evidence that Marcion's book preserved the primitive and original text; and on the other hand that the catholic Luke could be only an enlarged and amended one. This original Gospel must indeed have been very concise, since it could be contained together with a Latin translation by its side upon three sheets, without filling them. When these κεφάλαια are examined, it is evident to all eyes, that Epiphanius has only given us general hints. The 13th chap. runs thus: *while they were sailing, he fell asleep; but he stood up, rebuked the wind and the sea.* This certainly is no narrative—can be none. Who were they that sailed? who fell asleep? what authority had he to become angry and rebuke the winds? and was there a change after he had rebuked them? Look at the 23d chapter. *He said to the lawyer, What is written in the law? After the lawyer had answered, he said, Do that, and thou shalt live.* Why did this he question the lawyer? What had he replied which occasioned the admission, *Do that and thou shalt live?* The 44th chap. *Of the rich man and poor Lazarus, how he was carried by angels into Abraham's bosom.* The 45th chap. *Now is Lazarus comforted.* The 46th. *Abraham said, they have Moses and the Prophets; these should they hear: for they would not hear even one arisen from the dead.* Who without the assistance of our Luke could compose a parable or complete narration out of these three chapters? And who does not perceive that the words "*Of the rich man and poor Lazarus,*" are only the title of a chapter?

Would any one, in writing out a passage at full length, subjoin, as Epiphanius does, chap. 24th, καὶ λοιπόν, *et cetera*? Or after repeating the 5th chap. in the Scholia, *And all the multitude sought to touch him; and he lifted up his eyes,* could he have added καὶ τὰ ἑξῆς, *and so forth*, if it had constituted a complete passage?

As he thus gives only condensed accounts, we have simply the assurance, that the passage which Epiphanius read in his Luke, occurred in Marcion's, and indeed at full length and without any remarkable variation in the reading: otherwise he would have noticed the rejection of the parts which were wanting, or would, according to his custom, have exposed extraordinary readings, as corruptions. So far both were but one and the same Luke.

Further, there is a distinct fact remaining, viz. that in Marcion's Gospel certain chapters were wholly wanting, as likewise particular sentences and words from others. Were they excluded by him or have they been inserted by others? The ancients universally maintained the former; of late the latter has been asserted. His advocates want not a plausible reason for exculpating him. He has, as they correctly observe, suffered much to remain which runs counter to his tenets: now if he has left such passages untouched, it is not clear why he should have attacked and expunged others.

This would be of weight, were it not evident from his Antitheses that he found means to put such a construction upon these passages, that they did not embarrass him at all, and sometimes even favored his opin-



ion. On this point we have the testimony of Tertullian, who was well acquainted with his writings and had penetrated deeply into his system, of which little knowledge could be obtained without great pains, on account of its frequent obscure and enigmatical language. This writer the authors before mentioned with commendation have compared with Epiphanius, in reference to his testimony concerning Marcion's Gospel, and have found them almost invariably agreeing as to the historical accounts and particular passages rejected and retained, as well as variations in particular words. They have moreover collected out of Tertullian peculiar interpretations given by Marcion, by which he evaded the difficulties which he felt, and so accommodated passages at variance with his system, that they seem to be in his favor. For example, what could be more dangerous to his Docetism than the passage, Luke 24: 39. "Spiritus ossa non habet, sicut me videtis habentem;" he however merely assumed the word *spiritum* as understood: "Sicut me videtis—spiritum—habentem." (L. IV. Adv. Marcion, at the end.)

A further ground which has been relied on for Marcion's exculpation is the following. Passages are wanting in Marcion's Gospel which to all appearance are not prejudicial to his tenets; on which account no reason can be seen why he should have suppressed them. The contrary, however, has been maintained, and the incompatibility of such passages with Marcion's system shown. Even the most embarrassing of them, the parable of the prodigal son, has been evinced to be inconsistent with his doctrines. The prodigal, although born under the government of the severe and just God, the Creator of the world, did certainly know in his heart the merciful Deity and turn to him while he was not yet revealed, or else the stern Kosmokrator exhibited himself in this instance as a good and gracious Deity, which shakes the foundation of the Marcionite system.<sup>1</sup>

Thus nothing can clear him from the imputation of violent criticism: his arbitrary treatment of the Pauline Epistles testifies loudly and perpetually against him. Is it possible that these Epistles should have grown by degrees to their present condition? e. g. the Epistle to the Romans, out of eight sentences which Epiphanius quotes from Marcion's Apostolikon?

Under what *pretext* did he introduce a peculiar text of Luke? Did he assert that a pure and uncorrupted copy of the Gospel had descended to him from former times? If so we should find some trace of it.

In his Antitheses he argues from the rebuke which Paul gave Peter for his dissembled Judaism, that the Apostles generally had a prepossession in favor of Judaism; and indeed so far as to falsify the Gospel. ("Prevaricationis et simulationis suspectos *queritur* usque ad depravationem evangelii." *Tertull. L. IV. c. 3.*) It was the dishonest Apostles, who corrupted the truth, from whom the books of the Christians originated. ("Inde sunt nostra Digesta." *Ibid.*) He complains particularly in the Antitheses, of the Gospel which Christians call Luke's, as corrupted by the favorers of Judaism, in order to make Christ agree with the Law and the Prophets. ("Evangelium quod Lucae refertur

1 Olshausen, Die Echtheit der canonischen evangelien, 3d Absch. p. 207.

penes nos—per Antitheses suas arguit, ut interpolatum a protectoribus Judaismi ad incorporationem legis,” &c. IV. 4.)<sup>1</sup>

These corruptions then, according to Marcion, took place far back, and indeed in the very times of the Apostles, so that he debarred himself from the pretence of having procured a genuine copy, whose transmission to him would have been more probable, had the falsifications occurred at a later period.

Tertullian in his reply asks whether he does not see that the blame must then fall upon Christ himself for electing such Apostles, (L. IV. c. 3.) and further inquires where the true *Apostolorum instrumentum* was to be found; if it had been lost through these corruptions, it could not be possessed by Marcion himself. (*Ibid.*) This position he then leaves as though it were undisputed, and attacks him on another ground. He conducts the controversy with him as an *emendator*: Marcion was the first, from the days of Tiberius to those of Antoninus, who had ventured to step forward as an emendator of the Gospel. No emendation was needed; his book could not be regarded as an amended one, etc.<sup>2</sup>

Origen, too, gives it as the common opinion, that Marcion aspired to the reputation of a critic and emendator. Thus, when a malicious person corrupted one of his productions and excused himself by saying that he simply aimed to amend it, he replied that he certainly had amended it in the same way that Marcion had amended the Gospel.<sup>3</sup>

The criticising spirit of the master extended itself to his followers. When the charge of innovation and an origin of yesterday was brought against them, they defended themselves by asserting that Marcion had introduced nothing new which tended to separate the Law and the Gospel, but had only restored the truth which had been long since abused.<sup>4</sup> This medical care they continued to bestow upon the Gospel; and proceed, as the author of the Dialogue against Marcion says, to this hour, completely to destroy whatever he left untouched.<sup>5</sup>

They continue daily, says Tertullian, as they get into difficulty in regard to their positions, to change them; whence the Father of the

<sup>1</sup> Iren. Adv. Haeres. L. I. c. 27. “Semetipsum esse veraciorem, quam sunt hi qui Evangelium tradiderunt Apostoli, suasit (Marcion) discipulis suis, non Evangelium, sed particulam Evangelii tradens eis.”

<sup>2</sup> L. IV. Adv. Marcion c. 3. c. 4. “Emendator sane Evangelii a Tiberianis usque ad Antonina tempora eversi Marcion solus et primus obvenit, expectatus tandem a Christo poenitente jam, quod Apostolos prae-mississe properasset sine praesidio Marcionis; nisi quod humanae temeritatis non divinae auctoritatis negotium est haeresis, quae sic semper emendat, Evangelia dum vitiat . . . itaque dum emendat, utrumque confirmat, et nostrum alterius, id emendans quod invenit: et id posterius, quod de nostri emendatione constituens suum fecit.”—In reference to the other Gospels he says of him c. 5. “In quantum ergo emendasset, quae fuissent emendanda, si fuissent corrupta, in tantum confirmavit non fuisse corrupta quae non putavit emendanda. Denique emendavit, quod corruptum existimavit. Sed nec hoc merito, quia non fuit corruptum, rel.”

<sup>3</sup> Epist. ad Alexandrin. in Apolog. Ruffin. pro Origen. “Videte quali purgatione disputationem nostram purgavit, quali purgatione Marcion Evangelia purgavit.” At the beginning.

<sup>4</sup> Tertull. L. I. Adv. Marcion. c. 20.

<sup>5</sup> Dialogus (Pseudo-Origenis) contra Marcionitas. Sect. V. p. 147. Wetsten. ‘Ο γὰρ σχετῆς οὐδιοῦργεας τὰ κατὰ τὸν Ἀπόστολον, οὐ παντάπασιν ἀπῆλειψε, καὶ οὗτοι μέχρι τῆς δεῦρο περιαιροῦσιν, ὅσα ἂν μὴ συντρέχοι τῇ αὐτῶν γνώμῃ.

church advises them, to change for once in conformity with the eight Apostolical books of the church.<sup>1</sup>

We will now briefly recount the positions at which we have arrived. Eichhorn's belief that he had obtained the Marcionite Gospel complete, in the titles of chapters and the extracts given by Epiphanius, and on account of its brevity, that he had discovered the first draught of our Luke and an original Gospel, was a mistake arising from prepossession in behalf of a favorite hypothesis. The defence of Marcion on the ground that he has not taken pains to exclude much that is unfavorable to his doctrines,—much less, then, what was of a different character—we reject, because it is known that by misinterpretation he made such passages consistent with his doctrines. The second ground, that it does not appear why he should suppress the portions which are deficient, is by late investigations so entirely invalidated, that it is evident, on the contrary, he could not have suffered them to remain without detriment to his system; whence he comes under suspicion of the crime from which it is attempted to exculpate him. His treatment of the Pauline Epistles, however, convicts him of corruption. Neither he nor his followers ever pretended to possess a pure Gospel of the times of the Apostles; but only to have purified it from their corruptions. From a comparison of the Marcionite Gospel with our Luke it is evident that it was Luke which was disfigured and cut out by Marcion according to his own opinions.

The reasons which led him to pronounce the Luke of the Christians to be a book replete with Jewish additions, he detailed in his *Antitheses*. (L. IV. Adv. Marcion. c. 4.) Must he not in the same work have given reasons for his rejection of the other Gospels?

The first three books of Tertullian are occupied exclusively with a refutation of the *Antitheses*, in which the Heretic developed his principles respecting the creation, and its author, viz. the Deity of the Jews; respecting another Deity, the unknown and merciful God; respecting the two-fold Messiah, etc. His tenets could be supported only by a comparison of the sacred books of the Jews and Christians, whose contrariety gave him occasion to assume two primeval existences. But the sacred books of the Christians, he discovered, were not entirely consonant with his system; for as their authors, blinded by their Jewish prejudices, could not elevate their minds to the pure doctrine respecting the benevolent Deity, they therefore wilfully perverted it. But it was then incumbent on him to declare his Canon and to defend his rejections by argument. That he did this, in regard to Matthew, is clear from Tertullian's refutation.

The words of our Lord in Matthew: "That ye may be the children of your Father who is in heaven; for he maketh his sun to rise on the evil and on the good, and sendeth rain on the just and on the unjust," (5: 45) were not suitable to be uttered by the real Christ. The just God and Creator of the world could not so conduct, and the benevolent

---

<sup>1</sup> L. IV. Adv. Marcion c. 5. Irenaeus appears to have had the Marcionite sect in his eye in the words: "*Nec fas est dicere, quoniam ante praedicaverunt, quam perfectam haberent agnitionem, sicut quidam audent dicere, gloriantes, emendatores se esse Apostolorum.*" L. III. c. 1.



Deity would not be able to dispose of the rain and sunshine, works of the Creator of the world. So confused ideas respecting God must be falsely attributed to Christ. Marcion rejected the passage. Tertullian says he had erased it, *erasit*; in another place he contents himself with the expression, *detraxisti*, thou hast withdrawn them.<sup>1</sup> The word *erasure* is as current with him as *οβελιζειν* with the Greeks for rejection: he even says of Marcion's injunction of continence, "*materiam matrimonii eradit.*" (L. II. Adv. Marc. near the end.)

It is still worse in regard to the declaration of our Lord, "I am not come to destroy (the law) but to fulfil," Matt. 5: 17; in which the Messiah of the benevolent Deity very wrongly submits himself to the law of the Creator of the world. *He erased it*, says Tertullian again; but in another place he contents himself with the word *deny*, *negare*.<sup>2</sup> True, this father does not mention this passage in his reply to the Antitheses, but in his 4th and 5th books against Marcion; however, he repeatedly declares, that he reserved some objections to the Antitheses till he should bring the Marcionite Gospel under examination, and could more conveniently refer to it.<sup>3</sup>

In his 3d book against the Antitheses, he opposes Marcion's attack upon the prophecies of Isaiah concerning Immanuel, (7: 14.) It was essential to the heretic to deny the birth of Christ from a virgin, which Matthew (1: 23) has corroborated from Isaiah. Christ could not have been born, inasmuch as in order that he might owe nothing to the Creator of the world, he went about in the mere semblance of a man. He therefore argued that the prophecy certainly had no reference to Christ, who never was a warrior, and to whom what Isaiah says farther of Immanuel (8: 4), that he is to take away the riches of Damascus and the spoil of Samaria, is not applicable. To which Tertullian replies, that Marcion need only restore the account which he had withdrawn from the Gospel of the visit of the Magi and their gifts, and all would be plain.<sup>4</sup> And then he interprets the riches of Damascus

<sup>1</sup> Tertull. L. II. Adv. Marc. c. 7. "Nolunt Marcionitae in eodem Deo agnoscere pluentem super bonos et malos, et solem oriri facientem super justos et injustos . . . Nam etsi hoc quoque testimonium Christi in creatorem Marcion de Evangelio *eradere* ausus est, sed ipso mundus inscriptus est." L. IV. c. 17. "Euge, Marcion, satis ingeniose *detraxisti* illi pluvias ac soles, ne creator videretur." L. IV. c. 36. "Est utique optimus, qui pluit super justos et injustos, et solem oriri faciens super bonos et malos, sustinens et alens et juvans etiam Marcionitas."

<sup>2</sup> L. IV. Adv. Marc. c. 7. "Ostendentem in primo ingressu venisse se, non ut legem et prophetas dissolveret, sed potius adimpleret. Hoc enim Marcion ut additum erasit." L. IV. c. 9. at the end. c. 36. "Salvum igitur est hoc in Evangelio: non veni dissolvere." L. IV. c. 14. "Ego non veni legem dissolvere, sed adimplere. Frustra de ista sententia *neganda* Ponticus laboravit." His disciples went a step farther, and maintained that it should be read conversely. Dial. contra Marc. Sect. II. p. 63. *Οὐχ οὕτως δὲ εἶπεν ὁ Χριστός, λέγει γὰρ οὐκ ἔλθον πλεῖν τὸν νόμον, ἀλλὰ καταλύσαι.* Comp. Isidor. Pelus. L. I. Ep. 371. Ed. Paris, 1638. p. 97.

<sup>3</sup> L. III. Adv. Marc. c. 11. "Nunc ut haec omnia ad Evangelii distulerim examinationem." L. IV. c. 1. "Sed et istas (Antitheses) proprio congressu cominus, id est, per singulas injectiones Pontici caecidissem, si non multo opportunius in ipso et cum ipso Evangelio, cui procurant, retunderentur." L. I. c. 15. "Videbimus, si et ad Apostolorum vestrum discutiendum pervenerimus."

<sup>4</sup> Tert. L. III. Adv. Marc. c. 12. 13. "Provoca nunc, ut soles, ad hanc Esaiæ

and the spoil of Samaria, as referring to the gifts of the wise men. The story is too familiar for us to inquire from what Gospel Marcion had withdrawn it.

The language of Marcion respecting the commencement of the Gospels of Matthew and Luke, which Tertullian in another place (*De carne Christi*, c. 2.) quotes from him and turns to ridicule, may be here noticed: "*Quid illi cum angelo creatoris? et in uterum conceptus inducitur; quid cum Esaia propheta creatoris?—Aufer, inquit, molestos semper Caesaris census, et diversoria angusta—Magi ne fatigentur de longinquo—Melior sit Herodes, ne Jeremias glorietur,*" etc.

These are some of the reasons that have reached us, by which he justified his rejection of Matthew. Whether he entered into as much detail in respect to other books, or rejected them *in toto*, on account of their Jewish errors, is not known. It is clear from Tertullian that a similar fate befel several books of the N. T., as e. g. the Gospel of John and the Apocalypse. If thou hadst not, says he, intentionally, *de industriâ*, rejected or corrupted the Scriptures which gainsay thine opinions, the Gospel of John would have taught thee differently respecting the apparent human body; *confudisset te in hac specie Evangelium Joannis, praedicans spiritum columbae corpore delapsum.*" (*De carne Christi*, c. 3.) But here his memory or a false reading deceived this father of the church; for no known MS. reads *ἐν σώματι περιστεράς* in the passage, John 1: 32. Of the Apocalypse he says; "*Nam etsi Apocalypsin ejus Marcion respuit—in Johannem tamen stabit auctorem.*" (L. IV. Adv. Marc. c. 5.) He makes the same complaint as to the Acts of the Apostles. In this book Paul is recognized as an apostle, and he in turn confirms the statements of the Acts of the Apostles. It is therefore plain, for what reason it was rejected: "*Cur ea respuatis jam apparet;*" viz., because it does not distinguish God and the Creator of the world from each other. (L. V. c. 2.)

It is owing to Tertullian's mode of procedure that we are only thus superficially informed. Had he in his three books against the Antitheses accompanied Marcion step by step, presented each Antithesis and its proof, we should have been better informed on many points. He has, however, in opposition to his adversary, laid down three positions of special importance, in as many books, and undertaken to maintain them. These are, that there is only one God; that the God of both Testaments is the same; and that thus there is but one Christ. While occupied with his own positions, he has taken notice of his adversary's only in a passing manner and indistinctly, occasionally stating some of them in the 4th and 5th books.

Paul was in Marcion's eyes the sole and true Apostle, and his Epistles he consequently acknowledged; yet not all, and not without alter-

---

comparisonem Christi, contendens illam in nullo convenire. Primo enim, inquis, Christus Esaiæ Emmanuel vocari habebit; dehinc virtutem sumere Damasci, et spolia Samariæ adversum regem Assyriorum. Porro iste qui venit, neque sub ejusmodi nomine est editus, neque ulla re bellica functus est.—*Serva modum ætatis, et quaere sensum prædicationis: immo redde Evangelio veritatis, quæ posterior detraxisti, et tam intelligitur prophetia, quam renunciatur expuncta. Maneant enim orientales illi magi, in infantiâ Christum recentem auro et thure munerantes, et acceperit infans virtutem Damasci, sine praelio et armis, etc.*

ations. From these, as well as from his Gospel, Epiphanius has made extracts, or a collection of such passages, forty in number, as appeared of use in refuting Marcion, and remained unmolested in his amended text of Paul. He has also taken notice of peculiar readings; but the passages omitted he did not mark as he has in his extracts from the Marcionite Gospel. It was Tertullian's aim, in the 5th book of his confutation of Marcion, to convict the Heretic of error, from his own codex of the Pauline Epistles, and he has pointed out by the way alterations and suppressions of verses and longer paragraphs.

Epiphanius gives a list of the Epistles and their situation in the Marcionite *Ἀποστολικόν*, (as Marcion's collection of the Epistles was termed) in the following manner. The Epistle to the Galatians ranked first; then followed the first and second Epistles to the Corinthians; then that to the Romans; the two to the Thessalonians; that to the Laodiceans; to the Colossians; to Philemon; and that to the Philippians formed the conclusion. The Epistle to the Laodiceans was, as Tertullian and Epiphanius testify, and as extracts still extant prove, the same which is otherwise called the Epistle to the Ephesians.<sup>1</sup>

Tertullian, likewise, read them in the same order. He begins with the Epistle to the Galatians: "Principalem adversus Judaismum epistolam nos quoque confitemur, quae Galatas docet" (L. V. c. 2), and occupies with it the 3d and 4th chapters of the 5th book. From the 5th to the 11th chap., he treats of the 1st Epistle to the Corinthians; and from the 11th to the 13th, of the second. The 13th and 14th chaps. are devoted to the Epist. to the Romans; the 15th and 16th to the two to the Thessalonians; the 17th and 18th to that to the Ephesians or Laodiceans; the 19th to that to the Colossians; the 20th to that to the Philippians; and, lastly, the 21st to the Epistle to Philemon.

Thus Marcion's collection discarded the Epistle to the Hebrews; which would have demolished his whole system, had he not demolished it. He removed the Epistles to Titus and Timothy, and yet retained that to Philemon; and hence Tertullian with reason wonders that he should have admitted the Epistle to one individual and yet have excluded Epistles to others concerning ecclesiastical affairs. As Tertullian found the Epistle to Philemon, in the copy which was before him, yet unmolested, probably on account of its brevity, while Epiphanius, on the other hand, found it entirely disfigured, *ὁλοσχερῶς αὐτὴν διαστροφῶς παρ' αὐτῷ κείσθαι*, we may properly infer that Marcion's

<sup>1</sup> Epiphanius Haeres. XLII. p. 133. Basil. *Αἱ δὲ ἐπιστολαὶ αἱ παρ' αὐτῷ λεγόμεναι εἰσι, πρώτη μὲν πρὸς Γαλάτας, δευτέρα δὲ πρὸς Κορινθίους, τρίτη πρὸς Κορινθίους δευτέρα, τέταρτη πρὸς Ῥωμαίους, πέμπτη πρὸς Θεσσαλονικεῖς, ἕκτη πρὸς Θεσσαλονικεῖς δευτέρα, ἑβδόμη πρὸς Ἐφεσίους, ὀγδόη πρὸς Κολοσσαεῖς, ἐνάτη πρὸς Φιλήμονα, δεκάτη πρὸς Φιλιππησίους.* Ed. Petav. § 9. p. 309, 10. Coloniens. At the close of the extracts, before he passes to the Scholia, he once more gives a list of the Epistles acknowledged by Marcion, p. 141. Basil., and Petav. p. 321, where however the text is inaccurate. I propose to read: *Τῆς δὲ πρὸς Τιμόθεον πρώτης καὶ δευτέρας, καὶ πρὸς Τίτον, καὶ τῆς Ἑβραίων οὐκ ἔμμερμένων παρ' αὐτῷ.* The text of Epiphanius throughout requires correction. The edition of Petavius does not equal his reputation, and even the *Ed. Colon.* has become scarce. He speaks a second time concerning the title *πρὸς Λαοδικεας*, p. 274; and again p. 375. edit. Petav. Colon.



critical spirit descended to his followers, and that the latter completed what the master began.

The suppressions and alterations in Marcion's Apostolicon, when examined, as they have lately been,<sup>1</sup> lead to the same position which the ancients took in respect to them; viz., that he mutilated the Epistles to save his system. He had his choice either to do the one or give up the other. He could make use of two pretences to justify his criticism upon even anti-judaizing Paul; either that the Apostle of the Gentiles was not yet wholly free from Jewish fits, or that he suspected his writings to have been contaminated by the hands of the Jewish apostles. Tertullian indicates the latter, and he probably observed assertions of that nature in the Antitheses. (L. V. c. 9 on Coloss. 1: 16.) This pretence is in accordance with Marcion's general charge against the Apostles, of having corrupted the doctrines of Christianity by changing the readings of the Scriptures and especially of Luke's Gospel, which, he said, was disfigured by Jewish interpolations.

Now as the Evangelical codex of Tatian, setting aside the Genealogies and some other things, attests the existence of our Gospels entire; so Marcion's Apostolical codex is a historic document which attests ten of the Epistles of Paul, establishes their age, and adjudges them to the author to whom they are usually ascribed.

His Gospel attests *our Luke*, which he must have possessed, since he trimmed it to suit his own purposes and assigned the reasons for his pretended amendment in his Antitheses. His Antitheses in several places make the *Gospel of Matthew* the subject of criticism, and express disapprobation of it on account of the prevailing Judaism to which its author had surrendered himself. Marcion rejected, moreover, others of the Christian Scriptures, but his positions concerning them are not given with such precision, as to serve as ground for argument. He rejected generally the other Scriptures received by the orthodox, which, as Tertullian frequently reproaches him and as he himself confesses in one of his letters, he once acknowledged, before he renounced the orthodox party.<sup>2</sup>

#### PTOLOMAEUS AND HERACLEON.

Irenaeus connects them together and thus seems to have regarded them as contemporaries: yet he places Ptolomaeus first.<sup>3</sup> Tertullian, too, follows this order: he says, Valentinus marked out the road; Ptolomaeus paved it, and Heracleon made the side-walks.<sup>4</sup> But according to Origen,<sup>5</sup> the latter was *Ὁὐαλεντίνου γνώριμος*: he enjoyed the

<sup>1</sup> Aug. Hahn, "Das Evangelium Marcions in seiner ursprünglichen Gestalt." 2d Abschn. p. 50-66.

<sup>2</sup> De carne Christi. c. 2. "His opinor consiliis tot originalia instrumenta Christi, Marcion, delere ausus es, ne caro ejus probaretur—excidisti, rescindendo quod retro credidisti, sicut et ipse confiteris in quadam epistola, et tui non negant, et nostri probant."

<sup>3</sup> Iren. L. II. Adv. Haeres. c. 2.

<sup>4</sup> Tertull. Advers. Valentinianos, c. 4.

<sup>5</sup> Orig. Tom. II. in Joann. p. 60. Huet. Colon.

friendship or instruction of Valentinus ; much more than did Ptolomaeus. Of a different sect, Cerdo, Marcion's teacher, was their contemporary. Epiphanius, indeed, places him after Heracleon,<sup>1</sup> referring to the time when he acquired celebrity ; but the interval between them cannot possibly have been of much consequence, as Cerdo was distinguished under Hyginus, under whom Valentinus rose to be the head of a distinct sect.<sup>2</sup>

There is still extant a letter from Ptolomaeus to his pupil, Flora,<sup>3</sup> in which he imparts instruction respecting the contrariety between the Law and the Gospel, which had then become through Cerdo a subject of discussion, and warns her against the pernicious principles which some deduced from these Antitheses ; viz., that we must distinguish between the God of the Old Testament and that of the New, and that the former was the God of the Jews, Creator of the world, and only an imperfect God.

For the Apostle expressly declares our Saviour to be the Creator of the world when he, ὁ ἀπόστολος, says, πάντα δι' αὐτοῦ γεγονέναι καὶ χωρὶς αὐτοῦ γεγονέναι οὐδέν. This Apostle is clearly John. (1: 3.) But those who interpret the words of our Saviour, τὰ ὑπὸ τοῦ σωτῆρος εἰρημένα—οἰκία ἢ πόλις μεριθεῖσα ἐφ' ἑαυτήν, ὅτι μὴ δύναται σιῆναι, of the Jewish lawgiver and of the imperfection of the constitution which he formed, misunderstand our Lord. The first part of this is Matt. 12: 25, with the variation ἐφ' ἑαυτήν, as in Codex D ; the οὐ δύναται σταθῆναι, or, as B, L, K and some other MSS. read, οὐ δύναται σιῆναι, is in Mark 3: 25. Yet the coincidence as respects the last few words may be only accidental, and the whole may be a quotation from memory.

Not all the laws of the Old Testament are from God himself ; some are only from Moses, as the Saviour, διαλεγόμενός που ὁ σωτήρ, said to those who inquired of him concerning a bill of divorce : "Οτι Μοῦσῃς πρὸς τὴν σκληροκαρδίαν ὑμῶν ἐπέτρεψε τὸ ἀπολύειν τὴν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ· ἀπ' ἀρχῆς δὲ οὐ γέγονεν οὕτως. (θεὸς γὰρ φησι, συνέξενε ταύτην τὴν συζυγίαν) καὶ ὁ συνέξενεν ὁ κύριος, ἄνθρωπος μὴ χωριζέτω. The first part of this, as far as the parenthesis, in which he inserts an observation of his own couched in his well-known phraseology, is, with the exception of slight variations, to be found in Matt. 19: 8, and in no other Evangelist : "Οτι Μωϋσῆς πρὸς τὴν σκληροκαρδίαν ὑμῶν ἐπέτρεπεν ὑμῖν ἀπολύσαι τὰς γυναῖκας ὑμῶν· ἀπ' ἀρχῆς οὐ γέγονεν οὕτω. Comp. Mark 10: 5, 6. The conclusion, likewise, is in Matthew : "Ο οὖν ὁ θεὸς συνέξενεν ἄνθρωπος μὴ χωριζέτω. (19: 6.) The words, too, are in our Evangelist, in the very connection in which Ptolomaeus has presented them ; and are, in addition to the formula, the Lord says, more clearly designated as a quotation, by the expression, διαλεγόμενός ΠΟΥ—he says somewhere, in a certain place. So too Clemens Romanus, with this phraseology, has referred to a passage in Isaiah : λέγει γὰρ που· and with the same words, to another in the Proverbs of Solomon. (Clem. Ep. I. ad Cor. c. 15 and 21.)

Human traditions too, he further informs his pupil, had been mixed

<sup>1</sup> Epiphanius. Haeres. XLI. Κέρδων τις τουτοῦς καὶ τὸν Ἡρακλέωνα διαδέχεται.

<sup>2</sup> Iren. L. III. Adv. Haeres. c. 4.

<sup>3</sup> In Epiphanius. Haeres. XXXIII.

with the Law, as our Saviour declares, *δηλοῖ καὶ τοῦτο ὁ σωτήρ*. And now he quotes again, freely and from memory, yet so that we clearly recognize Matthew. The beginning: *Τιμᾷ τὸν πατέρα σου καὶ τὴν μητέρα σου, ἵνα εὖ σοι γένηται*, is rather from Moses than Matthew. But ye say, says our Lord to the teachers of the law: *δῶρον τῷ θεῷ, ὃ ἐὰν ὠφελήθῃς ἐξ ἐμοῦ* which, except the addition *τῷ θεῷ*, we find in Matthew, together with the following words: *καὶ ἡκυνώσατε τὸν νόμον* (so read Codd. C. 13 and 124.) *τοῦ θεοῦ διὰ τὴν παράδοσιν τῶν πρεσβυτέρων*· as likewise the words of Isaiah, which Matthew has employed in a very peculiar manner, *ὁ λαὸς οὗτος* as far as *ἐντάλματα ἀνθρώπων*, Matt. 15: 5, 6, 8.

The Law, he proceeds, may be considered generally under three points of view. One portion of it our Lord exalted to perfection; this is that *νόμος, ὃν οὐκ ἤλθε καταλύσαι ἀλλὰ πληρῶσαι*, Matt. 5: 17; that part which the Saviour came to fulfil, not to destroy. Another portion has been repealed; and the third was only a typical representation of that which was to come, and ceased of itself, when this took place: e. g. the law, a tooth for a tooth and an eye for an eye, is abrogated by our Saviour, when he says: *Ἐγὼ γὰρ λέγω ὑμῖν, μὴ ἀντιστῆναι ὅλως τῷ πονερώ· ἀλλ' ἐὰν τίς σε ῥαπίσῃ, στρέψον αὐτῷ καὶ τὴν ἄλλην σιαγόνα*. This too, with only a trifling difference in the order of the words, is found in Matt. 5: 39. Codex D, which in general contains a very ancient text, likewise omits *δεξιάν*.

Of that part which was only typical and consisted in ceremonial observances, Paul speaks (*δηλοῖ καὶ Παῦλος ὁ Ἀπόστολος*) when he says: *Τὸ πάσχα ἡμῶν ἔτιθε Χριστὸς, καὶ ἵνα ἦτέ, φησιν, ἄζυμοι, μὴ μετέχοντες ζύμης . . . ἀλλ' ἦτε νέον φύραμα*. The words are, according to Ptolemy's custom, transposed and given in a very free manner; yet evidently come from Paul, 1. Cor. 5: 7. The same Paul, explaining the type of the passover and the unleavened bread, *ὁ Ἀπόστολος Παῦλος . . . τὸν εἰκόνα . . . διὰ τοῦ πάσχα καὶ τῶν ἀζύμων δείξας*, speaks of that part of the law which was done away; *εἰπὼν τὸν νόμον τῶν ἐντολῶν ἐν δόγμασι κατοργησθαι*· and also of that which only needed perfecting and completion: *ὁ μὲν νόμος, εἰπὼν, ἅγιος, καὶ ἡ ἐντολὴ ἀγία, καὶ δικαία καὶ ἀγαθή*. The first passage is here expressed freely and with the infinitive form of the verb; but otherwise it is literally, Eph. 2: 15. The other is literally, Rom. 7: 12.

Of the works of Heracleon considerable fragments are extant. In Clement of Alexandria there is an exegetical fragment on Luke 12: 8, 9. *πᾶς ὃς ἐὰν ὁμολογήσῃ ἐν ἐμοί*, as far as *ἀγγέλων τοῦ θεοῦ*, from which, *τοῦτον τὸν τόπον ἐξηγούμενος*,<sup>1</sup> he endeavors to support the position, that it is sufficient to acknowledge Jesus by our actions and to attest his doctrines by our life, without adding an oral confession, e. g. as in times of persecution. Hence our Lord says *ἐν ἐμοί*, when he speaks of confession, and *μέ* when he speaks of denial. For the *ἐν ἐμοί* refers to those who live in him through conviction and instruction, and in whom, consequently, he also lives. Under such circumstances denial is not conceivable; for one must then deny himself, which cannot be: *διόπερ ἀρνήσασθαι ἐαυτὸν οὐδέποτε δύναται*. To these last

<sup>1</sup> Lib. IV. Strom. c. 9. Ed. Ven. 595. Sylb. 502.



words he appears to attach considerable importance, as if they were relevant to the argument and of similar authority with the preceding. Paul expresses himself in the same manner respecting Jesus himself: ἀρνήσασθαι αὐτὸν οὐ δύναται. (2 Tim. 2: 13.)

In an appendix to the works of Clement of Alexandria, Heracleon comments with much particularity on an apostolical passage: οὕτως ἀκούσαντες τὸ ἀποστολικόν,<sup>1</sup> which is found in Matt. 3: 11, 12. and also in Luke 3: 17, in the same words. There is no evidence in favor of either of the two in particular.

Numerous and important fragments of his commentaries on John's Gospel, are presented by Origen in his exposition of the same, in order to correct the heretic. (Tom. I. in Johann. III. VI. VII. VIII. IX. X. XI. XII. XIII. XIV. XV. XVI. XVII. XVIII. XIX. XXI. XXIV. XXVI.<sup>2</sup>

Heracleon has sometimes, in his exposition, referred to other biblical passages. But he has treated them cursorily and rather alluded to them, than extracted them at length; often only their sense is introduced into the current of his discourse.

The story (John 4: 46.) of the royal officer or soldier, he interprets in his peculiar manner (Origen. Tom. VIII. in Joann.), understanding by βασιλικός the Demiurgus. In this exposition he incidentally remarks, that ἐν τῷ, in the passage, οἱ υἱοὶ τῆς βασιλείας ἐξελεύσονται εἰς τὸ ἐξώτερον, the perdition which awaits the followers of the Demiurgus is spoken of.<sup>3</sup> The passage is Matt. 8: 12, with the variation ἐξελεύσονται, however, which occurs in Bianchini. (Cod. Veron. et Vercell.)

In another place (Tom. XVI. in Joann.) he refers, under the formula κατὰ τό, to the words, ὁ θείρισμός πολὺς, οἱ δὲ ἐργάται ὀλίγοι. And (Tom. XIV.) among other biblical quotations, he speaks of the Son's coming, ζητῆσαι καὶ σῶσαι τὸ ἀπολωλός. The two passages are word for word in Matt. 9: 37. and 18: 11; and likewise in Luke 10: 2, and 19: 10. There is no means of decision in favor of either.

In the course of his remarks (T. XIII.) he has evidently introduced the words of 1 Cor. 13: 12; without quoting them literally or treating them as a quotation. With these he connects the words, ἄρρήτα ῥήματα, ἃ οὐκ ἐξὸν ἀνθρώποις λαλῆσαι, which are peculiar to the 2d Epist. to the Corinthians, 12: 4.<sup>4</sup> Thus too he refers, for the expression λογικὴ λατρεία, to the Apostle (Tom. XIV. in Joann.), καθ' ὃ καὶ ὁ Ἀπόστολος διδάσκει. This occurs in Paul to the Romans 12: 1.<sup>5</sup>

We therefore derive the following evidence from what remains of the writings of Ptolemy and Heracleon. From the former, we have

<sup>1</sup> Ex scriptis Prophetarum Eclogae. c. 25.

<sup>2</sup> They have already been extracted from Origen's works by Grabe, Spicileg. Patr. Vol. II. p. 85—117. According to De la Rue's arrangement, Opp. Orig. Vol. IV. Comm. in Jo. Tom. I. p. 66. 73. T. VI. p. 102. 117. 120—22. 125. 130. 138—40. 157. T. X. p. 170. 179. 194. 196. 200—2. T. XIII. 220. 221. 224—27. 229. 230. 234. 235. 237—39. 241. 242. 248. 251—52. 255—56. 260—63. 265—67. 274. 275. 276. 77. T. XIX. p. 296. 302. T. XX. p. 316. 332. 337—40. 345. 59. 360.

<sup>3</sup> According to De la Rue's edition. Tom. XIII. p. 76.

<sup>4</sup> T. XIII. p. 220.

<sup>5</sup> T. XIII. p. 234.

five passages extracted out of Matthew's Gospel, which retain the expression, with various degrees of exactness, but are all easily recognized; one from John's Gospel, not wholly literally, but with the reference *ὁ Ἀπόστολος*; passages under Paul's name, from the Epistle to the Romans, the 1st to the Corinthians and that to the Ephesians. From Heracleon, fragments of a commentary on the whole of John; an exposition of a passage in Luke; a passage from Matthew under a form of citation. We have, moreover, a reference to the Epistle to the Romans, under the expression *ὁ Ἀποστολος*; and, without any intimation that they are citations, one passage, freely but evidently from the 1st Epistle to the Corinthians, one word for word from the 2d Epistle to the Corinthians, and one from the 2d to Timothy.

#### VALENTINUS AND HIS SCHOOL.

Ptolomy and Heracleon were indeed disciples of Valentinus; but they left his sect and deviated in many points from his system. But notwithstanding this secession, he remained the head of a large and very extensive sect which took its name from him.

We still possess some remains of his works; viz. fragments of his letters, of his homilies, and of a treatise on the origin of evil.<sup>1</sup> But in these fragments, which were extracted only to show some of his peculiar ideas, no arguments from the sacred books occur, so that for our purpose they might as well not be in existence.

Irenaeus, however, has thought the biblical arguments by which he supported his system, worthy of his attention, and has replied to them, by which means they have come to our knowledge.

He had, as he says, frequent intercourse with Valentinians themselves; and what is of more importance, he had writings of the disciples of Valentinus before him, from which he drew.<sup>2</sup> We, indeed, hear the teacher from the mouth of his disciples; we want not now, however, a perfect description of his system, but only such things as ordinary abilities are sufficient to state.

It is first of all worthy of notice, that the fathers never charged him with mutilating the biblical writings, or with rejecting and retaining of them just what he chose. Tertullian even concedes that he received the biblical Codex entire; but he reproaches him with having abused it more by his misinterpretations than Marcion had with his knife.<sup>3</sup> Irenaeus states that Valentinus gave the preference to John's Gospel; and only complains of him and his followers, that, besides the four acknowledged Gospels, they had one more than other Christians, which they even called *Evangelium veritatis*.<sup>4</sup> He says besides, that they drew their arguments not only from the evangelical and apostolical wri-

<sup>1</sup> In Clement of Alexandria, L. III. Strom. L. II. Strom. Also L. IV. Strom. Origen. Dialog. contra Marcion. Sect. IV. Grabe Spicileg. Pat. et Haer. Vol. II. p. 50—58.

<sup>2</sup> L. I. Adv. Haer. Praef. n. 2. *Ἐντυχόν τοῖς ὑπομνήμασι τῶν, ὡς αὐτοὶ λεγούσι, Οὐαλεντίνου μαθητῶν.*

<sup>3</sup> Tertull. de Praescript. Haeret. c. 38.

<sup>4</sup> Iren. Lib. III. c. XI. n. 7. Adv. Haeret.

tings, helping themselves by explanations and ingenious interpretations, but also from the Law and the Prophets.<sup>1</sup>

We might draw from this an advantageous conclusion in respect to the sacred books generally, which we see were received as such in the days of Irenaeus and Tertullian; but we will first examine how this general and unsuspecting testimony in favor of the heretics is confirmed in detail, and then every one is at liberty to estimate the strength of this cumulative evidence.

The father does not quote the parables and narratives of the historical books of the New Testament on which they founded their arguments, at full length, as perhaps they were presented in their own writings. Hence it will be necessary that we should judge from their reasoning and deductions whether their arguments in any cases do really imply such particularities in circumstance or language, as force us to recognise our historical documents and as, so to speak, individualize them.

They refer among other things to a parable of our Saviour, on which they attempt to ground the number of their thirty Aeons. It is not cited word for word, probably on account of its extent. The parable is that of the laborers who were sent at different hours into the vineyard. They were sent, say they, about the first, the third, the sixth, the ninth, and the eleventh hours. Now these hours, one, three, six, nine and eleven, make up the number thirty; hence thirty hours or Aeons.<sup>2</sup>

We find a parable respecting laborers in a vineyard in Matt. 20: 1, seq. Now was it this to which they alluded? In such a representation it must have been wholly accidental what hours, and how many, were named. It would even have been sufficient, if it had been said generally, at different hours, or simply in the morning, at noon, and at evening. But in Matthew the laborers are sent *πρωῖ*—or *μία ὥρα* (v. 12),—about the first, the third, the sixth, the ninth and eleventh hours; exactly as it is represented above. Were there any difference as to one of the hours, their argument would not be just. Thus Matthew's narrative is presupposed in all its circumstances; circumstances which were wholly accidental, and depended upon the fancy of the writer. And Irenaeus then concludes: "So did they abuse the Holy Scriptures," etc.

The story of the woman who had suffered twelve years from an issue of blood does not appear in Matthew with the same circumstances as are given by the Valentinians. But is it not thus represented in Mark or Luke? (Mark 5: 25, seq. Luke 8: 43.)

Her condition is stated in the words of Mark, *παθοῦσα δώδεκα ἔτη*, and they lay much stress in their argument upon the expression *παθοῦσα*, as well as upon the *δώδεκα ἔτη*. For they attempt to inculcate from it, that one of their spiritual existences, the twelfth Aeon, *endured severe sufferings*, and was delivered from them by another power, *τὴν ἰασιν τοῦ πεπονθότος αἰῶνος*, and that *ἡ παθοῦσα δώδεκα ἔτη*

<sup>1</sup> Ibid. Lib. I. c. III. n. 6. *Καὶ οὐ μόνον ἐκ τῶν εὐαγγελικῶν καὶ τῶν ἀποστολικῶν πειρῶνται τὰς ἀποδείξεις ποιῆσθαι, παρατρέποντες τὰς ἐρμηνείας καὶ ῥαδιουργοῦντες τὰς ἐξηγήσεις, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐκ νόμου καὶ προφητῶν κ. τ. λ.*

<sup>2</sup> Iren. L. I. c. I. n. 3.



ἐκείνη ἡ δύναμις is here meant. When the woman touched Jesus, he asked, *τίς με ἥψατο*; as we find in Mark 5: 30. What they say farther, that by this question he intended to instruct his disciples, *διδάσκοντα τοὺς μαθητάς*, agrees with Mark only, where the disciples come directly into notice: *καὶ ἔλεγον οἱ μαθηταὶ κ. τ. λ.* Iren. L. I. C. III. n. 3.

The story of a certain Anna, mentioned in the Gospel, *καὶ διὰ τῆς Ἀννης τῆς ἐν τῷ Εὐαγγελίῳ κεκουσσομένου προφητιδος*, who was a prophetess, and had lived seven years with her husband, but had passed the remaining period, till our Saviour's coming, in a state of widowhood, occurs with all these briefly noticed circumstances in Luke's Gospel, 2: 36. The story of a certain Simeon, who, giving thanks, took the Saviour in his arms, and said: *νῦν ἀπολύεις τὸν δοῦλόν σου, δέσποτα, κατὰ τὸ ῥῆμά σου ἐν εἰρήνῃ*, (which represents the Demiurgus, who perceived his near departure at the coming of the Saviour and gave thanks,) occurs, with these circumstances and these words of Simeon, in the same Evangelist, 2: 39. (Iren. L. I. C. VIII. n. 4.)

They refer to John, the disciple of our Lord, by name, as having spoken expressly of the first eight Aeons. They adduce as proof the first chapter of John's Gospel, which they explain after their own manner. Irenaeus quotes their own language as follows:<sup>1</sup> John, the disciple of our Lord, wishing to describe the creation of the universe, or the way in which the Father evolved every thing from himself, supposes first an *ἀρχήν*, a principle which he also calls *μονογενῆς* and *θεός*, in which the Father produced all things originally and gave forth the Logos from himself, etc., whence he says: *ἐν ἀρχῇ ἦν ὁ λόγος κ. τ. λ.*

According to the foregoing observations, what the father of the Church has asserted in respect to the biblical Codex of the Valentines must be correct, viz. that they received it entire, without mutilating it at all and without exception of any particular parts, and that they caused it to speak for them only by misinterpretation.

We might add very considerably to the number of arguments in favor of some of the Gospels, particularly of Luke; but we will only subjoin further a few which relate to Matthew. The Iota with which the name Jesus begins signifies ten Aeons; hence our Saviour spoke with so much emphasis of the Iota. This they show from his words: *Καὶ διὰ τοῦτο εἰρεκένοι τὸν σωτήρα—Ἰῶτα ἐν, ἡ μία κεραία οὐ μὴ παρελθῇ ἕως ἂν πάντα γένηται.* The words are Matthew 5: 18 as far as the expression *ἀπὸ τοῦ νόμου*, which they could not cite, as by it the passage would have been restricted to the Old Testament. (Iren. L. I. C. III. n. 2.)

The Saviour spoke of a separating and rending power of the Horus in the words "I am not come to send peace but a sword." The figure and the phraseology are found in Matthew 10: 34. *Τὴν δὲ διοριστικὴν αὐτοῦ (ἐνέργειαν) ἐν τῷ εἰπεῖν· οὐκ ἦλθον βαλεῖν εἰρήνην, ἀλλὰ μάχαιραν.* (Iren. L. I. C. III. n. 5.)

Theodotus, as we have seen, sometimes expatiates on the tenets of

<sup>1</sup> L. I. C. VIII. n. 5. "Ετι τε Ἰωάννην τὸν μαθητὴν τοῦ Κυρίου, διδάσκουσι τὴν πρώτην ὀγδοάδα μεμνησκέσαι αἰταῖς λέξεσιν λέγοντες οὕτως "Ἰωάννης ὁ μαθητὴς τοῦ Κυρίου βολόμενος εἰπεῖν τὴν τῶν ὅλων γένεσιν, καθ' ἣν τὰ πάντα προέβαλεν ὁ πατήρ, ἀρχὴν τινα ὑποτίθεται κ. τ. λ."

Valentinus and his disciples. They maintained, he says, that the Saviour first awoke the *ψυχὴ* from slumber, and kindled a flame within it. To this these words of our Saviour point: *διὰ τοῦτο εἰρηκεν—λαμψάτω τὸ φῶς ὑμῶν ἔμπροσθεν τῶν ἀνθρώπων*. They are Matt. 5: 16.<sup>1</sup> Further, they interpreted the passage: *Ἐπὶ τινες τῶν ὧδε ἐσθηκότων, οἳ οὐ μὴ γεύσονται θανάτου, ἕως ἂν ἴδωσι τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐν δόξῃ*, not of the Apostles standing around, but of the things of the universe which encompassed our Saviour.<sup>2</sup> All these words occur in Matthew, except *ἐν δόξῃ*, which variation, however, is found likewise in some MSS. and ancient versions. (Matt. 16: 28.) But this quotation, as far as the last words, occurs too in Mark 9: 1, and Luke 9: 27. It would therefore be very unsafe to determine in favor of Matthew in particular. This citation is selected here rather for another purpose, viz. to induce us to note that the evidences for particular Gospels are not so numerous as we might desire, from the fact that the passages cited are frequently alike in several Evangelists. This remark applies especially to Matthew and Luke.

The Valentinians, like the Marcionites, were unable from their principles to allow Christ a human body: such a body, they say, must have sprung not from the spirit or from God, but from the will of man, (*Tertull. De Carne Christi*, c. 15) which would be contrary to the Gospel. “*Sic enim Scriptum esse contendunt: non ex sanguine, nec ex carnis voluntate, nec ex viri, sed ex Deo natus est.*” (*Ibid* c. 19.) Tertullian charges them with fraud, as follows: “*John 1: 13 should be read . . . sed ex Deo nati sunt. Hoc quidem capitulo ego potius utar, quum adulteratores ejus obduxero.*” It is not however read so invariably. Some western MSS. give the passage as above (and so Irenaeus, L. III. *Adv. Haer.* c. XVI. n. 2. and c. XIX. n. 2.), the purple colored MS. of Verona has it so, and Augustine, at least once. Thus this reading was indeed approved by the Valentinians; but evidently was not introduced by them. Here the excellent Griesbach is chargeable with an oversight: it was not our reading, *οἱ—ἐγεννηθήσαν*, but the opposite, of which Tertullian accused the Valentinians.

They applied to the same purpose the words of Matthew 1: 20. It is written, they said, “*per virginem, non ex virgine, quia et angelus in somnis ad Joseph: Nam quod in ea natum,—de spiritu sancto est; non dixit ex ea.*” (*De Carne Chr.* c. 20)

Paul, too, is said to have spoken of those exalted spirits which they call Aeons, *τὸν Παῦλον τοὺς δὲ αἰῶνας ὀνομάζειν*, when he said: *εἰς πάσας τὰς γενεὰς τοῦ αἰῶνος τῶν αἰώνων*. These words are in the Epistle to the Ephesians, 3: 21.<sup>3</sup>

These Aeons took what each of them possessed of peculiar excellence and united the whole in a single being; thence was formed Jesus or the Saviour. Hence Paul calls him *all in all*: *ὑπὸ δὲ Παύλου φανερώς διὰ τοῦτο εἰρησθαι λέγουσι*—they then adduce in confirmation, Rom. 11: 36 and particularly Coloss. 2: 9. *Ἐν αὐτῷ κατοικεῖ πᾶν τὸ πλήρωμα τῆς θεότητος*, and a passage from the Epistle to the Ephesians (1: 10), which however is given somewhat freely.<sup>4</sup> To this Sa-

<sup>1</sup> Epitome ex scriptis Theodoti. § 2.

<sup>2</sup> Lib. cit. § 4.

<sup>3</sup> Iren. L. I. c. III. n. 1.

<sup>4</sup> L. I. c. III. n. 4.

viour the Father then granted supremacy over all the Aeons, ὅπως ἐν αὐτῷ τὰ πάντα κτίσθῃ, τὰ ὄρατα καὶ τὰ ἀόρατα, θρόνοι, θηότιτες, κυριότητες.<sup>1</sup> This passage is interwoven with the context and employed without any formula of citation; it is found in Coloss. 1: 16. It is noticeable on account of the peculiar reading of the Valentinians: *θρόνοι, θεότιτες*. Theodotus also cites it as found in the writings of the Valentinians, and with him it has still another addition, *βασιλείαι, θεότιτες, λειτουργίαι*. (§ 43.)

But they appeal, with express mention of Paul's name, to other Epistles of his, in order to prove some of their fables in respect to the virtue of the cross: *Παῦλον δὲ τὸν Ἀπόστολον, καὶ αὐτὸν ἐπιμιμνήσκεσθαι τοῦτον τοῦ σταυροῦ λέγουσιν, οὕτως, ὁ λόγος γὰρ τοῦ σταυροῦ τοῖς μὲν ἀπολλυμένοις μωρία ἐστὶ, τοῖς δὲ σωζομένοις ἡμῖν δύναμις θεοῦ· καὶ πάλιν, ἐμοὶ δὲ μὴ γένοιτο ἐν μηδενὶ καυχᾶσθαι, εἰ μὴ ἐν τῷ σταυρῷ τοῦ Χριστοῦ, δι' οὗ ἐμοὶ κόσμος ἐσταύρωται, καὶ γὰρ τῷ κόσμῳ*. (Iren. L. I. c. III. n. 5.) The first passage is 1 Cor. 1: 18; the other Galat. 6: 14, with two observable variations.

Paul, they say, has alluded in the Epistle to the Corinthians to the wanderings of Achamoth, a female Aeon, who was lost from the Pleroma: *τὸν Παῦλον λέγουσιν εἰρηκέναι ἐν τῇ πρὸς Κορινθίους, ἔσχατον δὲ πάντων, ὥςπερ ἐν τῷ ἐκτρώματι ὥφθη καὶ μοί*. The passage is 1st Cor. 15: 8; and immediately after, they quote also 1 Cor. 11: 10. (Iren. L. I. c. VIII. n. 2.)

They assert that Paul has spoken of the male and female Aeons and their intercourse: *καὶ τὰς συζυγίας, τὰς ἐντὸς τοῦ πληρώματος τὸν Παῦλον εἰρηκέναι γάσκουσιν*. They then cite, word for word, Eph. 5: 32. (Iren. L. I. c. VIII. n. 4.)

They divided mankind into three classes; into *ὕλικους, ψυχικοὺς, πνευματικοὺς*. For the validity of this division they appeal to Paul, among others: *Παῦλον διαφύκην εἰρηκέναι χοϊκούς, ψυχικοὺς, πνευματικούς*. The expression of the Apostle which they cite occurs in 1 Cor. 15: 48, and 1. Cor. 2: 14, 15. They then adduce also the passage Rom. 11: 16, with express reference to Paul, *Παῦλον εἰρηκέναι*. (Iren. L. I. c. VIII. n. 3.)

In all, they have quoted from the following Epistles: that to the Romans, the first to the Corinthians, those to the Galatians, to the Ephesians and to the Colossians.

Among the curiosities of the British museum there is (*Cod. Askew.*) a work of Valentinus, *Πιστὴ Σοφία*, translated into the dialect of Upper Egypt.

From the characters, this MS. would seem to be one of the oldest MSS. in the Coptic language. Woide used it for his edition of the Sahidic New Testament; but only in passages where the *Πιστὴ Σοφία* has remarkable variations, or supplies chasms. Yet a large number of passages from the Gospels and from several Epistles is noticed; e. g. Matt. 7: 7, 8. 10: 36, 41. 11: 14, 28. 13: 9. 24: 4, 22, 43. 28: 18. Luke 14: 34, 35. 22: 28, 29, 30. John 4: 10, 14. 17: 16. 19: 34. Rom. 13: 7, 8. 1 Cor. 2: 9. 12: 12. and Heb. 2: 11, the words of which last, however, are put into our Lord's mouth. Were the scope of this

<sup>1</sup> L. I. c. IV. n. 5.



work more extensive, it would afford us many advantages besides those we now speak of.

### THE EBIONITES

always disliked the apostle Paul, whose anti-Jewish sentiments, it is easily imagined, were disagreeable to them. They had, therefore, their own Acts of the Apostles, in which James was the principal personage, and which favored, as they wished, their Jewish prejudices. This writing contained attacks upon Paul, to whom they even denied a Jewish origin, appealing to his own confession. They found their pretence, says the writer who makes us acquainted with the contents of this book, upon the following passage: "I am a native of Tarsus, a citizen of no mean city."<sup>1</sup> These words are in our Acts of the Apostles, 21: 39.

### BASILIDES AND ISIDORUS,

father and son; both men of learning and leaders of a Gnostic sect. Some large fragments of the writings of the son have been preserved by Clement of Alexandria. But they rather present his opinions, than the grounds on which he vindicated them.<sup>2</sup>

In one of these fragments he treats of marriage and celibacy. When the Apostles (it begins) asked our Lord, whether it were not better to refrain from marriage, he said, *οὐ πάντες χωροῦσι τὸν λόγον τοῦτον*. Jesus really used these words, in the connection in which they here stand (Matt. 19: 11), after his disciples had made the objection: If it be so, it is not good to marry. Our Lord says further, (it proceeds,) that there are eunuchs by birth, and eunuchs by compulsion; but those who have made themselves eunuchs for the kingdom of heaven's sake, etc. Of these three sorts of eunuchs our Lord does speak, in the passage in Matthew which has been mentioned, and, although the passage is handled very freely, yet the last part certainly comes very near to Matthew: *οἱ δὲ ἕνεκα τῆς αἰωνίου βασιλείας ἐνουχίσαντες ἑαυτοὺς*.<sup>3</sup> (Matt. 19: 12, *οἵτινες ἐνουχίσαν ἑαυτοὺς διὰ τὴν βασιλείαν τῶν οὐρανῶν*.) Thus the connection, the purport, and in part the language point us to Matthew.

He uses equal freedom in another citation, in which he appeals to the Apostle: *λέγειν τὸν Ἀπόστολον—ἄμεινον γαμήσαι ἢ πυροῦσθαι*. Yet Paul, 1 Cor. 7: 9, *κρεῖσσον γὰρ ἐστι γαμήσαι ἢ πυροῦσθαι*, is easily recognized.<sup>4</sup>

Epiphanes, the son of Carpocrates, of whose writings, likewise, some

<sup>1</sup> Epiphanius Haeres. XXX. n. 16. *Πράξεις δὲ ἄλλας καλοῦσιν Ἀποστόλων εἶναι . . . ἀναβαθμοὺς γὰρ τινὰς καὶ ὑψηλότητας δῆθεν ἐν τοῖς ἀναβαθμοῖς Ἰακώβου ὑποτίθενται, ὡς ἐξηγουμένοι κατὰ τε τοῦ ναοῦ καὶ τῶν θυσιῶν . . . ὡς καὶ τοῦ Πάβλου ἐν ταῦτα κατηγοροῦντες . . . Ταρσεῖα γὰρ αὐτὸν, ὡς αὐτὸς ὁμολογεῖ καὶ οὐκ ἀρνεῖται, λέγοντες· ἐξ Ἑλλήνων δὲ αὐτὸν ὑποτίθενται, λαβόντες τὴν πρόφασιν ἐκ τοῦ τόπου διὰ τὸ φιλαληθὲς ὑπ' αὐτοῦ ῥηθὲν, ὅτι Ταρσεῖς εἰμι, οὐκ ἀσήμερον πολλῶς πολίτης κ. τ. λ.*

<sup>2</sup> Lib. I. Strom. L. II. L. III. & L. VI.

<sup>3</sup> Lib. III. Strom. c. 1. Epiphanius Adv. Haeres. Lib. II. Haeres. XXXII. p. 211. Edit. Petav. Colon. p. 95. Edit. Basil.

<sup>4</sup> Lib. III. Strom. loc. cit.

small fragments have reached us,<sup>1</sup> opposes the tenets of Isidore respecting the Law, and charges him with misunderstanding the *Apostle's* words: *μη συνεις τὸ τοῦ Ἀποστόλου ῥητὸν, λέγοντος—διὰ νόμου τὴν ἁμαρτίαν ἔγνω.* They are in Rom. 7: 7.

Of Basilides himself, the father, little remains, although Agrippa Castor knew of twenty-four books written by him upon the Gospel.<sup>2</sup> This loss is by no means unimportant, since this man appeared as a teacher as early as Hadrian, and probably even under Trajan, and closed his life under Antoninus Pius, at a period when others first began to attract notice.<sup>3</sup>

In the largest fragment of him, the following passage has struck my eye: *ἀλλὰ ἐξ ἄλλων ὀντως ἐγκαλούμενοι, ἵνα μὴ ὡς κατὰ δίκαιον ἐπὶ κακοῖς ὁμολογουμένοις πάθωσι· μηδὲ λοιδορούμενοι ὡς ὁ μοιχὸς, ἢ ὁ φονεὺς, ἀλλ' ὅτι Χριστιανοὶ περικότες, ὅπερ αὐτοὺς παρηγόρησεν μηδὲ πάσχειν δοκεῖν.*<sup>4</sup> This passage is found, in substance, in the 1st Epistle of Peter 4: 14, 15, 16; and is certainly in a measure peculiar. There are, besides, similarities in the language: *ἵνα μὴ ὡς κατὰ δίκαιον ἐπὶ κακοῖς ὁμολογουμένοις πάθωσι, μηδὲ . . . ὡς ὁ φονεὺς.* Peter expresses himself: *μη γὰρ τις ὑμῶν πασχέτω ὡς φονεὺς . . . ἢ κακοποιὸς*—and, *ἀλλ' ὅτι Χριστιανοὶ περικότες* λ. Peter says: *εἰ δὲ ὡς Χριστιανὸς μὴ αἰσχυνέσθω.*

Origen, also, has presented us in his Commentaries on the Epistle to the Romans with a fragment of the writings of Basilides, in which he interprets the words of Paul, Rom. 7: 9, 10, as supporting one of his favorite tenets, the transmigration of souls; not very happily it is clear, but yet not without talent and ingenuity.<sup>5</sup>

So many testimonies do we find in the 2d century alone, and these in the poor remains of a literature in regard to which the rage for destruction has been designedly active and eminently successful—so many that not one of those books which were not disputed in the orthodox church wants confirmation. We must except only the Epistle to Titus; this remains unauthenticated, while the Gospel of John, of Matthew, the 1st Epistle to the Corinthians and that to the Romans, and still other books, are by testimony placed far beyond suspicion. Let us now imagine how overwhelming would have been the external evidence, if the disposition to destroy had not been so extensively gratified.

If, however, the evidences for any parts are but feeble, only connect them with those which have been collected from the fathers of the church; and the two opposing parties, who were never agreed in

1 Lib. III. Strom. c. 2. Grabe Spicileg. Patr. T. II. p. 61, 62.

2 Euseb. Histor. Eccles. L. IV. c. 7.

3 Grabe Spicileg. T. II. p. 36, 37.

4 Clem. Alex. L. IV. Strom. c. 12. Sylburg. p. 506.

5 Origen. L. V. Comment. in Epist. ad Rom. c. 5. Tom. II. Opp. Lat. Edit Basil. p. 530. "Ego inquit (Paulus) mortuus sum: caepit enim jam mihi reputari peccatum. Sed haec Basilides non advertens de lege naturali debere intelligi, ad ineptias et impias fabulas sermonem apostolicum traxit in Pythagoricum dogma . . . dixit enim, inquit, apostolus, quia ego vivebam sine lege aliquando, hoc est antequam in istud corpus venirem, in eam corporis speciem vixi, quae sub lege non esset, pecudis scilicet vel avis," etc. Edit. De la Rue, Vol. IV. p. 549.

their lifetime, the fathers and the heretics, will unite in erecting a monument to truth.

It is moreover worthy of special attention, that these accidentally rescued testimonies do not merely attest the existence of the New Testament in the 2d century, but also testify to an earlier origin of this book. There are few of them whose force is confined to their own period; which do not mount higher, and give security likewise that these are the writings of the Apostles—that Peter, John, Paul were their authors.

## CHAPTER II.

### REMARKS IN RESPECT TO THE CREDIBILITY OF THESE WRITINGS.

#### § 9.

It is ordinarily the case that when it is supposed the genuineness of these books is established, the investigation of their credibility is forthwith undertaken. As to the didactic writings, such an investigation can have place only so far as they refer to events. Since, however, nearly all the occurrences to which they refer are contained in the historical books, the whole inquiry may be restricted to the exclusively historical books of the New Testament. Are then the facts which these communicate true?

A question involving so much as this does, is proposed too early, I should think, before we are at all informed as to the historical character of the writers, the sources from which they drew, and their relation to each other. The reply can only be the result of several other and deeper investigations, of which we must first await the issue.

We are well aware of what has been done on this subject by learned men, such as Less and Paley; but we could give no epitome suited to the compass of these pages, even had we time for the purpose.

There are cases, however, in which the reasoning that as such and such books are genuine, they are therefore credible, is perfectly correct. Any inference which we can draw from the mere supposition that *the books are genuine*, is not out of order, and may properly find a place in this connection.

When I consider the character of the man whose portrait is drawn in the Gospels, I find it to be too lofty and noble for any Jewish mind to have invented. The tranquil, quiet greatness of the sage, in whose heart lofty plans are unobservedly ripening, who, solely from the force of powers within, aspires to the highest mental elevation from the midst of the lowest and most ordinary circumstances, projects a moral transformation of his race, undertakes to purify the whole body of ethical science, devotes himself with unshaken energy to accomplish the task, pledges, and actually resigns his life in its behalf, regardless of the ignominious manner in which it is taken away;—such a Regulus in the



cause of human morality is too fine a conception for ordinary Jews, especially in that period of national decay.

Then, further, the manner in which this personage is conducted through all situations, in the midst of injuries, plots and dangers, among friends and enemies, is so peculiar, that no philosopher could have more beautifully depicted a philosopher's life. Conscious dignity accompanies him throughout, and in every scene of his life his conduct is the fittest for the occasion, the period and the persons concerned, and also, in every point of view, the noblest. He appears at first, and continues through all the train of events, till the close of his life, to exhibit in himself that high moral cultivation, and to give in his conduct the pattern of that morality, which he was striving to introduce among men. To conduct and maintain such a character through all the circumstances of life, is a dramatic attempt not suited to the capacity of invention possessed by ordinary and uncultivated Jews.

Moreover, his pure and lofty views in respect to religion and morality, his unprejudiced elevation above Judaism, his extensive insight into the plan and constitution of our moral nature, are far beyond that and preceding ages, and beyond the spirit of the whole nation, from which he steps forth a solitary phenomenon. Though Plato and Xenophon have sketched the character of Socrates, and delineated it in such a manner that scarce any mortal can equal this picture of a wise and moral man, we may presume that they superadded ideal lineaments, or at least exaggerated the real to the ideal. But our writers were not Platos. The Jews had no Xenophon or Aeschines; they could lend no perfection to their portrait, could impart little nobleness to their subject; it was all they could do, to describe with unadorned simplicity that which they observed. He must have been such a person, he must have spoken and acted thus, or they could not have thus depicted him.

Nothing is objected to this but the miraculous coloring given to his life. Permit me to make an incidental remark. Was he not, then, himself a miracle? In vain do we look around in his nation to find the circumstances which nourished this blossom, which matured this mind in so short a period, which in thirty years produced a Socrates, who surpasses the Athenian in his life and his death, in the grandeur of his views, in the purity of his knowledge and doctrines; and this at a time when it would seem that the highest talents must have been overcome by the power of prejudice, of superstition, of authority, of the narrow-mindedness of his contemporaries and the abject mental state of the nation. And how long did he labor for this transformation of the world, to pave the way for which, no human life would seem to be sufficient? But a few years: he passed by, to use his own words, as the lightning, which appeareth for an instant in the east, and shineth forth unto the west. (Matt. 24: 27.)

He himself and the greatest event that ever occurred stand alone in the history of the world. How was Christianity established in three years? Where is the historic chain to this phenomenon? who has yet discovered its causes, and its connexion with existing and preceding events? Let us consider a little—if he himself and the change which he effected be so peculiar, ought we in a case in which the usual order of things is so far transcended, to expect the usual order of things?

The nation in which he appeared was, we know, looking for miracles : by these alone whoever proposed changes or improvements in religion, could justify his claims as a teacher ; they were the sole condition on which he could require belief and regard, and could count upon success. But Jesus met with success. He found credit and adherents where he taught in his native land, without the aid of force, of wealth or the protection of the great, by which others were aided ; with nothing in his favor but himself. And, notwithstanding that with the co-operation of the public magistrates he was seized and executed when he had scarcely unfolded his system, he found credit still after his death, and so ardent was this faith that it speedily extended itself from his own country, and nation, throughout the known world. Now if success in his native land depended on the condition of his working miracles, how can we separate this condition from his actual success ?

### § 10.

The deduction of the credibility of the *Acts of the Apostles* from their genuineness is still more simple. The Apostles continued long after Jesus' death exposed to general observation, and the more notorious the enterprise of their Teacher became, the more were the eyes of men, for a series of years, fastened upon them. Their history was then well known, as a multitude of men were scattered through all countries who had been and were witnesses of their conduct and acts. How could they then consent to the promulgation of a work by their fellow-laborer, which extolled a constancy they did not possess, narrated sufferings and efforts in the cause of Christ, the falsity of which was notorious ; which specified actions in this and that place, of which no mortal knew and which witnesses could step forward to contradict ? Could even their adversaries have contrived any thing more ruinous to their cause, than the promulgation of a narration describing as their achievements, things which had never happened and the falsity of which could be attested ?

## CHAPTER III.

WRITING-MATERIALS—PUBLICATION—LOSS OF THE AUTOGRAPHS—COLLECTION OF THE BOOKS—THE CANON.

### § 11.

It is by no means to no purpose that we are so diffuse in our investigations in regard to the books of the New Testament and even take notice of the writing-materials employed. We shall thus be enabled to obviate some difficulties which may hereafter arise.

The ancients, it is known, wrote with a reed (*calamus*) and ink (of the preparation of which we cannot now speak) upon papyrus. This

last substance is particularly worthy of notice. The abundance of *πάπυρος*, (*ἀπ' ἧς ὁ χάριτης κατασκευάζεται*), which Egypt produced, and the moderate price at which she exported the *charta*, made the writing-material of the king of Pergamus of questionable superiority; so that the Romans of this period speak but seldom of the *membrana*, and even then frequently mean by it the *membranam ex cortice*, the bark of plants. The usual expression of this period is *charta, χάριτης* (2d Epistle of John, v. 12), and sometimes *papyrus* itself.

The sheets were made from the papyrus-plant which grew in Egypt, and more rarely in Syria and the vicinity of Babylon.<sup>1</sup> The membranes of the plant, from which it was prepared, were not equally tough and durable. That was accounted the best from which the *ἱερατική*, or priests' paper was made, which was intended for religious writings and the sacred documents of Egypt. Augustus gave the preference to a finer and more pliant sort; and this circumstance was enough to induce the Romans to give the first rank to the Augustan species. That of Livia held the second rank, and the priests' now held the third.

This continued till the time of Claudius, who brought about a change. The Augustan species was too thin, and too easily broken through. It was therefore retained for letter-writing only; for other purposes a firmer sort was selected.<sup>2</sup> Thus, following the custom of the times, we have to distinguish two kinds of writing-material in the Scriptures; one for the Epistles and another for the historical productions.

## § 12.

The ancients seldom wrote their compositions with their own hand; but dictated them to their freedmen and slaves. These were either *ταχυγράφοι*, *amanuenses*, *notarii*, rapid writers—or beautiful writers, *καλλιγράφοι*, *librarii*, and likewise *βιβλιογράφοι*. It was the office of these last to transcribe in an elegant manner what the former had taken down hastily from dictation; it was their business to write out books and other lasting documents.<sup>3</sup> The *ab epistolis*, whose work is seen in books and on stones, appear to have been distinct from both. For the accuracy of the transcripts reliance was placed on an emendator, or corrector, *ὁ δοκιμάζων τὰ γεγραμμένα*.<sup>4</sup>

A large part of the books of the New Testament were dictated in conformity with this custom. Paul notes as a peculiar circumstance, in the Epistle to the Galatians, that he had written to them with his own hand. (Gal. 6: 11.) In other cases he did not even write the salutation with his own hand, except for a special reason. (2 Thess. 3: 17. 1 Cor. 16: 21. Coloss. 4: 18.) The amanuensis, who wrote the Epistle to the Romans, has mentioned himself in it. (Rom. 16: 22.)

Historical works were always to receive, by means of the calligraph-

1 Plinius Nat. Hist. L. XIII. c. 22.

2 Ibid. c. 23, 24. Strabo. XVII. p. 800. *ἡ δὲ βελτίων ἡ ἱερατική*.

3 Euseb. H. Eccl. L. IV. c. 23. De vita Constant. XIV. c. 36. Photius Cod. 121. p. 162. Hoeschel. Montfaucon. Paleogr. Graec. Lib. I. c. 5.

4 Nysseni Epist. in Monument. ineditis Zacagnii. Epist. XII. p. 382.



ist and the corrector, that extreme perfection which was required in a writing that was to come into the hands of many readers.

### § 13.

Compositions of every kind could be multiplied only by transcripts. When they had passed in this way to others, they were beyond the control of the author, and were published. Christians had not the advantage of publication by means of booksellers till a later period.<sup>1</sup>

The publication was preceded by the *recitatio*, which sometimes occurred in presence of only a few friends, and frequently with great preparations before many persons invited for the purpose.<sup>2</sup> In this way the author was known as such, and the world understood beforehand what it had to expect. If the composition pleased, it was requested for the purpose of transcription,<sup>3</sup> and then the work left the hands of its author and belonged to the public.

Frequently an individual sent his literary production to some distinguished man, as a present, *strena*, *munusculum*; or prefixed his name to it, in order by this particular dedication of a work to him, to testify his friendship or esteem. Even if it was only presented or sent to him, and he accepted the gift, he was considered bound to introduce it to the world, or as the *patronus libri*, who had pledged himself to duties like those of the *patronus personae*. It was now his part to provide for its publication by means of transcripts, to facilitate its access *ad limina potentiorum* and to be its *defensor*. There were other allusions of this nature to the Roman law which were applied to this subject.<sup>4</sup>

Thus too did the first writers of the Christian school make their appearance before their public. The Epistles were read aloud in those assemblies and churches to which they were directed, and then whoever wished to possess them made a copy of them himself or caused one to be made. The historical productions were made public by the authors, *per recitationem*, in the Christian assemblies: the subject and the general interest in it procured them readers and transcribers.

Luke dedicated his writings to an illustrious person named Theophilus. It thus became the duty of the latter to multiply copies of them and to distribute them among those who could appreciate the value of such a gift and had the strongest claims to his friendly attention.

### § 14.

These books, when once circulated among the multitude, encountered all the fortunes which have befallen other works of antiquity. Yet copies were always deposited with the Presbyters, to be used in the

<sup>1</sup> Martial. L. I. Epigr. 6. Cleric. Ars. Crit. p. III. L. I. c. 2. § 10, 11.

<sup>2</sup> Such a recitation is fully described in Dialog. de Orat. c. 9. at the end of the works of Tacitus.

<sup>3</sup> Juvenal. Sat. III. 41, 42.

<sup>4</sup> Comp. the dedication of *Statius* to *Melior* of the 2d book *Sylvarum*, and the dedication to *Stella* prefixed to the 1st and that to *Marcellus* to the 4th book. Martial Epigram. L. XII. c. 3.

churches and to serve as authoritative documents for the copies of others.<sup>1</sup>

In this respect, it is true, only the original writings possessed an authority beyond objection, and we might hence expect that peculiar care would have been taken to preserve them to posterity. Yet we have no certain information where they were kept, how long they were to be seen, or by what accident they were lost to the world. For those passages of the ancients which have been supposed to communicate information respecting the Autographs have in fact a totally different purport.

Ignatius, the Martyr, for instance, expresses himself thus in his Epistle to the Philadelphians: "I myself have heard some say: If I do not find it ἐν τοῖς ἀρχαίοις or ἀρχαίοις, I do not give credence to the Gospel; and when I replied, that it was certainly written, they answered ὅτι πρόκειται, the other deserves the preference."

Now let it remain for a moment undecided what is the meaning of τὰ ἀρχαῖα or ἀρχαῖα, and which is the true reading. The connexion in which he says this is the following.

He is speaking (6th section, seq.) of Judaism, which was always aiming to impose itself upon the Christian sect, and to incorporate itself and all its appendages with the Christian system. Against this assumption of Judaism he expresses himself with earnestness, and declares that he himself with difficulty escaped the heresy. This subject he pursues as far as the 11th section, where he proceeds respecting this pretension: "I have even heard some say, If I do not find it ἐν τοῖς ἀρχαίοις, I do not believe what is said in the Gospel."

The section immediately following shows with equal clearness that he is speaking of Judaism. "I have nothing against the priests of the covenant,—they are worthy of honor; but far more excellent is the High Priest who enters into the holy place, and is the confidant of the secrets of God . . . both are good, the Old Testament and the Gospel."

From this connexion, from the preceding and subsequent expressions of this father, it is easily seen that the Old and New Testaments are contrasted, and that, consequently, this τὰ ἀρχαῖα, in opposition to the Gospel, can signify only the Old Testament, which Judaizing persons had the audacity to prefer even above the New.

Now which reading we are to adopt as the true one, τὰ ἀρχαῖα, the books of the Old Testament, or ἀρχαῖα, the cases<sup>2</sup> in which the writings of the Old Testament were kept, is a matter of indifference; and I am only bound to sustain the interpretation I have affixed to the words, ὅτι πρόκειται.

The Judaizers, then, asserted that they would not believe the Gospel, when what it declared was not to be found in the Old Testament. When Ignatius replied to them, it is actually written thus; they had the audacity to say *The latter deserves the preference*. I find πρόκεισθαι in this somewhat unusual sense in Sextus Empiricus, (*Hypoth. L. I. c. 4.*) Ὡς μηδὲνα μηδενὸς πρόκεισθαι τῶν μαχομένων λόγων ὧν πιστότερον. In the larger Epistles of Ignatius a passage follows the words above quoted, in which πρόκεισθαι again appears in this sense:

1 Irenaeus, Adv. Haer. Lib. IV. c. 32. n. 2.

2 Schmid Historia Canonis, L. I. Sect. II. § 81. p. 131, 132.

οὐ γὰρ πρόκειται τὰ ἀρχαῖα τοῦ πνεύματος, the written law has in no wise the preference over that of the spirit, etc. This interpolation therefore justifies the proposed interpretation.

Tertullian in one instance appeals to *litteras authenticas* of the Apostles, which have sometimes been thought to mean originals.<sup>1</sup>

But he is speaking in the context of the pure doctrines which he says could be reasonably expected to exist only in such churches as were established by the Apostles and had been addressed by them, as e. g. Rome, Corinth, etc. where still their *authenticæ litteræ* were read.

Now as that which immediately precedes and follows relates merely to the purity of the doctrines which descended uncorrupted from successor to successor, the intervening assertion, that *litteræ authenticæ* were then extant, must have a like import. The *litteræ authenticæ*, then, were only Epistles which had been preserved pure and uncorrupted.

He uses *authenticum* in this sense in another place likewise. He complains of the Latin version and accuses it of a designing or ignorant corruption of the Apostle's words: "Sciamus plane non sic esse in Graeco authentico, quomodo in usum exiit per duarum syllabarum aut callidam aut simplicem eversionem."<sup>2</sup> Here *authenticum* stands opposed to the inaccurate or falsely interpreted text.

We have the most irrefutable proof, however, that Tertullian, and not only he but Clement, Origen, and the fathers of the church generally knew nothing of the existence of autographs, in all those works in which they combat the heretics. We find them accusing Marcion and his sect of falsifying the Bible, and we find them sometimes perplexed with difficulties in their copies. All the elaborate arguments which they have deduced from the connexion, and from parallel passages in support of their readings,—all that Tertullian has sought to prove with so much particularity against Marcion, might have been spared, had the autographs been in existence. Reference might have been made in one word to their decision, for they would have been the only authoritative and supreme arbiters in doubtful cases between them and their adversaries.

## § 15.

Thus we seek in vain for the original MSS. at a time when nothing was known of them. They were lost, without so much as a hint to us by what events a possession so important to the church perished. How shall we explain this singular fact?

Some preceding observations will perhaps solve the difficulty. To speak first of the Epistles: though Paul and his companions wrote scarcely any of their compositions themselves, though they were written by Tertius or some other penman *ab epistolis*, the salutation at the end was generally attached by their own hand. This was sufficient to give them the value of originals, and a legitimate authority to determine respecting the text when errors arose.

<sup>1</sup> Tertullian. de Praescript. c. 36.

<sup>2</sup> Ibid. de monogam. c. 11.



This circumstance, then, presents us no explanation. Perhaps the writing-material may afford us more satisfaction. It was the weak, easily-injured Augustan paper, or that of Claudius, upon which, according to the fashion of the times, letters were written. Now curiosity, devotion and industry occasioned many disfigurements in it before it was extensively circulated and copied. Thus, if a copy was often exposed to such ill-usage, it is easily seen that, with ever so good intentions, it could last but a few years; and if under very gentle treatment it should chance to last twenty or thirty years, the period from Nero to Trajan, or at any rate to Severus and Caracalla, would be long enough for its destruction.

On the other hand, the writing-material of historical works was more durable and better fitted to brave the ravages of time; but there were other circumstances which were peculiarly dangerous to the originals of these. After the *ταχυγράφοι* had taken them down from the mouth of the author, they were committed to the Calligraphist or Bibliographist, who wrote them fairly, and conferred upon them the decent external appearance which became such works. Then the corrector had his part to perform. Thus a copy which was sent to a church or collection of Christians had already passed through three hands and was itself in fact only a transcript, little superior to others which were as beautiful.

Let us now suppose, as it is very natural to do, that the same *librarius* who was employed to make this copy, made copies likewise for opulent individuals and other churches—and there was no original at all, or there were perhaps ten or more of which none could claim superiority.

From these circumstances we can comprehend how the autographs entirely disappeared, though of so much importance to the ancients, without our having any knowledge of their fate.

## § 16.

The works which persons had in their possession were sent to each other, and in this way were made collections of an author's writings. The Epistles of Ignatius were thus collected together. Polycarp of Smyrna sent those which he had to Philippi, and the church at Philippi sent him in return the compositions of this martyr which they possessed.<sup>1</sup> Somewhat more than forty years before, the like occurred in regard to the works of the Apostles. Such a mutual exchange the churches at Laodicea and at Colosse made, in respect to Paul's Epistles, (Coloss. 4: 16.)

In this way churches communicated to other churches their apostolical documents. This is what Tertullian well observes against Marcion, who did not pay equal deference to all the Gospels: the unequivocal declaration of those churches, says he, which were founded by the Apostles, testifies in favor of the other Gospels, which we have obtained through and from those churches.<sup>2</sup>

Hence no writings could obtain a place in this collection, which were not supported by the testimony of the churches which received the

<sup>1</sup> Epistlola Polycarpi, near the close. Euseb. Hist. Eccles. III. 36.

<sup>2</sup> Lib. IV. Adv. Marc. c. 4.

Epistles from the Apostles, or by which the works were first published after being sent to them.

Though some of these writings were directed to private men, as were Luke's two historical books, the Epistle to Philemon, the 2d and 3d of John, or those to Titus and Timothy, they were either friends of the author whose testimony is unexceptionable, or men endowed with apostolical authority in teaching, whose credit is superior to that of the churches which were instructed by them.

It has been inferred from an expression of Peter, that the collection of the Pauline writings was in his times complete. For he reminds his readers (2 Peter 3: 15, 16), that his beloved brother Paul also, according to the wisdom given unto him, had written the same to them, as also *in all his epistles*, in which he speaks of this subject. But the expression *all* is restricted by what follows—all in which he has mentioned the subject of the coming of the Lord. Yet it is evident from this that he supposes his readers already in possession of several Pauline Epistles, that they were then very widely circulated, and were to be found in great numbers, in various places.

When several of these were once written together, it would not be long before the idea of a complete collection would arise. There was already one Codex before the world, viz. that of the Old Testament, and this suggested the idea of forming one for the new dispensation. The parallel between the two dispensations, the *καινή* and *παλαιὰ διαθήκη*, which had already been pointed out by our Lord and extended by Paul, favored and occasioned such imitations.

The collection was early finished in all those churches between which a close connexion and reciprocal intercourse could be maintained, i. e. in those which were near the borders of the Mediterranean sea, where under the Roman dominion three quarters of the globe met together in brisk traffic and commercial intercourse. Churches within this sphere of universal activity, as e. g. the churches at Philippi and Smyrna, had certainly a complete collection in the *days of Trajan*. Otherwise they would not have undertaken another which in importance bears no comparison with this, viz. a collection of the Epistles of Ignatius which was made by Polycarp.

Some one may doubtingly ask, Is it true, as is here assumed, that as early as the times of the Apostles, christian churches were thus connected? We must suppose that they were. All Christians considered themselves as brethren wherever they might be, and all churches as mutually bound to each other. The connexion, *κοινωνία δόσεως καὶ λήψεως*, the alleviation of the necessities of saints, most certainly existed. When Paul was commissioned by the Apostles to go to the heathen, attention to the poor was enjoined. (Galat. 2: 10.) This connexion extended not merely to the churches of Syria and Asia Minor, to Antioch (Acts 11: 29), and the Galatian churches (1 Cor. 16: 1, 2, 3), but also to societies of believers in Europe, of which there were so many in Macedonia and Achaia. (2 Cor. 8: 1, seq. 9: 4. Rom. 15: 26.) This beautiful agreement in works of love bound the European and Asiatic churches to the native land of Christianity, which was then the object of their benevolence, and bound them and all to each other; for in adversity each had a claim upon the rest for succour.

It is also well known, that Christians, when they undertook a journey, were commended to the assistance and kind offices of the churches (Acts 18: 27. Rom. 16: 1, 2. Coloss. 4: 10), and received peculiar passports *συστατικὰς ἐπιστολάς* (2 Cor. 3: 1), which certainly supposes the existence of a social connexion. Nothing could be more natural, according to Christian regulations, than the maintenance of mutual intercourse. To lodge strangers, to wash their feet (1 Tim. 5: 10), to practise Christian hospitality, to assist the brethren in their affairs, were works of piety strictly enjoined (Rom. 12: 13. Heb. 13: 2. 1 Pet. 4: 9.) We say nothing of the fact that private individuals on occasion sent salutations to distant brethren (Rom. 16: 21, 23. Philipp. 4: 22), and churches to churches—the churches of Asia to that at Corinth—the church at Babylon to those of Asia Minor (1 Cor. 16: 19. 1 Pet. 5: 13.)

We may admit an exception as to churches situated farther from the circle of activity and commercial intercourse, which would come more slowly to the knowledge of certain of the biblical books. From this circumstance, it seems to me, we may explain in part the doubts which prevailed in particular churches in respect to some of them.

Under Trajan's second successor, Antoninus Pius, Marcion, as we have seen above, made an eclectic collection, for the use of his disciples, from the Codex of the Catholic church, which Codex must consequently have been in existence when he perpetrated the outrage. Valentinus and his sect possessed a similar one, containing all those books which the fathers towards the close of the 2d century found in the Codex of the orthodox church. Valentinus therefore must have possessed it entire.

It was the distinguished and peculiar prerogative accorded to these writings, and for a long time the only mark of distinction which could be given them, that they were publicly read in the christian assemblies. As in the religious meetings of the Jews this honor was usually conferred only upon the Law and the Prophets, so among the Christians this eminent prerogative was granted only to the writings of the Apostles together with the Old Testament which they retained from the Jews. Thus Peter reckons Paul's Epistles, while the author was still alive, among the *γραφαίς*, Holy Scriptures (2 Pet. 3: 15, 16.) And, as the Jews called their books by the general title, the Law and the Prophets, so the Christians comprehended theirs under the denomination, the Gospels and the Apostles, and compared or contrasted them together, *νόμοι, προφῆται, εὐαγγέλια καὶ ἀπόστολοι*.<sup>1</sup>

As these compositions were acknowledged to be *γραφή*, Holy Scripture, and as such were entitled to be read publicly in the assemblies, the collection of them could be delayed no longer, and then the books could no longer be circulated without inspection, or be mutilated, enlarged or altered at pleasure. They were under the protection of the church to which the collection pertained, and which was instructed and edified from it.

<sup>1</sup> Ignat. Epist. ad Philadelph. § 5. Epistola ad Diognetum c. XI. *Ἐἴτα φόβος νόμου ἔδεται καὶ προφῆτων χάρις γινώσκεται, καὶ εὐαγγελίων πίστις ἴδρται, καὶ ἀποστόλων παράδοσις φυλάσσεται.* Just. Martyr. Apol. Maj. c. 67. Tertull. de Praescript. c. 36. Comp. Apolog. c. 39. Hippolyt. de Christo et Antichristo. 58.



From this peculiar prerogative, they were denominated *δεδημοσιευμένα βιβλία* and *δεδημοσιευμέναι γραφαί*, public books, books made public; while, on the other hand, such others as were in the hands of Christians and were not permitted to be publicly read, were called *ἀπόκρυφα*, *ἀπόκρυφα βιβλία*, *libri secreti* and *absconditi*.<sup>1</sup> We find, too, that in opposition to the *δεδημοσιευμένα βιβλία*, the others were denominated *ιδιωτικά*.<sup>2</sup>

This exclusive prerogative of the apostolic writings is well exhibited by an ancient teacher, in speaking of Hermas. It is proper to read him, says he, but he can never be *made public with the Prophets or Apostles*.<sup>3</sup>

The (so called) *canones Apostolorum*, after enumerating (Can. 84.) the sacred books, say concerning the Constitutions of Clement, that they *should not be made public to all*: *ὡς οὐ χρή δημοσιεύειν ἐπὶ πάντων*.

Origen remarks as follows on Matt. 27: 9: "This is found in none of the public books *in publicis scripturis*; (the text is extant in Latin only) in none of those *which are read in the church or synagogue*; but only in the *secret* book of Elias, *in secretis Eliæ*."<sup>4</sup>

He observes in another place respecting the mode of Isaiah's death, that nothing concerning it is to be found *ἐν τοῖς κοινοῖς καὶ δεδημοσιευμένοις βιβλίοις*, but only *ἐν ἀποκρύφοις*.<sup>5</sup>

This mark of distinction so restricted the Canon, that no book could find admission which did not derive its origin from the authorized messengers of Christianity.

## § 18.

But this arrangement was gradually undermined. Certain churches received letters upon memorable occasions from celebrated teachers and preserved them to be read as memorials and for the purpose of edi-

<sup>1</sup> The word *ἀπόκρυφον*, *liber absconditus*, as Augustine expresses it, is not derived from the technical critical language of the Greeks, but from that of the Jews, who called such writings ספרים חסודים (Hottinger Thes. Philol. L. II. c. 2. sec. 1.) For they were not deposited in the book-chest in which the Holy Scriptures lay, but in separate receptacles in concealed places. Thus, as the learned agree, Hezekiah *concealed* a book on medicine. (Mishnah, Tract. Pesach. c. 4. n. 9.—בגנז ספר רפואת והודו לי.) A biblical MS. which had three errors on one leaf was required to be corrected: one with four to be *concealed*. (Gemar. Babyi. Tract. Menachot. c. III. sect. 7.) Justin translates it by *ἀφανὲς ποιεῖν*. (Dial. cum Tryph. c. 120.) *Ἀπὸ τῶν ὁμολογουμένων μέχρι νῦν ἐφ' ἡμῶν γραφῶν*, says he, have I taken arguments, *ἀεὶ ἐνενοήκεισαν οἱ διδάσκαλοι ἡμῶν ἐν ᾧ ὅτε ἀφανῆ ἐπεποιήκεισαν*. In opposition to *ἀφανὲς ποιεῖν*, Origen makes use of the expression *φανερὰ βιβλία*. (Epist. ad African. c. 9.) The first in whom I meet with the expression, *ἀπόκρυφος*, is Clement of Alexandria. (L. III. c. 4. Strom. p. 524. Venet.) *Ἐρῶν δὲ αὐτοῖς τὸ δόγμα ἐκ τινος ἀποκρύφου*. The expression is frequent in Origen, and is sometimes to be found in Tertullian.

<sup>2</sup> Lambec. Biblioth. Caes. Vind. Tom. III. p. 45. 46.

<sup>3</sup> Anonym. apud Muratori, (Antiq. Med. Aev. Tom. III. p. 853.) "Et ideo legi quidem cum oportet, sed publicare in ecclesia populo neque inter prophetas completum numero, neque inter apostolos in finem temporum potest."

<sup>4</sup> Origenes Vol. III. p. 816. De la Rue.

<sup>5</sup> Ibid. Tom. X. In Matth. Vol. III. p. 465.

fication upon stated days of the year. Thus the church at Corinth received a letter from Clemens Romanus, with which they refreshed their memories from time to time. Probably the case was the same with the Epistles of Ignatius. By degrees such letters came to be read in other churches also, so that e. g. Clement's Epistle received this testimony of public veneration in very many churches.<sup>1</sup> Sometimes this honour was accorded likewise to Hermas.<sup>2</sup>

Little as this custom could deceive learned men, it yet tended to mislead the common people, and sometimes even the ministry, and it was to be apprehended that such writings would in this way usurp the authority of canonical books. One of our oldest MSS., the Codex Alexandrinus, as is well known, contains Clement's Epistle; and the *Canones Apostolorum* before mentioned have enumerated two of this father's Epistles among the sacred books.

It therefore became necessary to distinguish and separate what time began to confound, and to take sure means to put a stop to error. Hence arose catalogues of the sacred books which received the name of *Canon*.

I no where find the word in this sense before the third century, when it first appears in the writings of Origen, and only in passages which are extant in the old translation alone. Towards the close of his preface to Solomon's song, he says; "Quae in scripturis, quas *canonicas* habemus, nusquam legimus, in apocrypho tamen inveniuntur;" and again on Matth. 27: 9: "Hoc in nullo regulari libro (*κανονικῷ*) positum invenimus, nisi in secretis Eliae."<sup>3</sup>

In the fourth century it is common with Christian writers, and with them *κανὼν* is a rule of faith, and a *canonical* book means an authoritative book in matters of faith. Origen says, in the preface before mentioned, of such books as were not of this number, "non admitti ad auctoritatem." Jerome expresses himself in a similar manner in his preface to Proverbs: "They cannot be admitted in confirmation of the religious tenets of the church" ("non admitti . . . ad auctoritatem ecclesiasticorum dogmatum confirmandam.") Rufinus closes the Canon which he presents in his work on the Apostles' Creed, with the remark: "These are the books on which our fathers founded their articles of belief." He then proceeds: "The un-canonical books may indeed be read, but never used in proof of articles of belief," (non tamen proferri ad auctoritatem ex his fidei confirmandam.) Athanasius says, in presenting us with his catalogue, that the doctrines which lead to eternal blessedness are revealed only in the canonical scriptures; they alone are the fountains of salvation.<sup>4</sup>

We may here pass by the other significations of the word *κανὼν*; for in reference to the books of the New Testament it means the rule

1 Euseb. Hist. Ecclesiast. Lib. IV. c. 23. . . ἐν πλείστοις ἐκκλησίαις ἐπὶ τοῦ κοινοῦ δεδημοσιευμένη.

2 Euseb. H. E. L. III. c. 3.

3 Tom. III. App. Ed. De la Rue. p. 36, and 916.

4 Athanas. Fragm. Festal. Epist. Opp. L. II. Ταῦτα πηγαὶ τοῦ σωτηρίου . . . ἐν τούτοις μόνοις τὸ τῆς εὐσεβείας διδασκαλίων εὐαγγελίζεται.

of faith, and that is said to be canonical which is authorised to declare this rule.<sup>1</sup>

### § 19.

The oldest catalogue extant, in my opinion, is that of an anonymous writer of the church of Rome ; it belongs to the beginning of the third century. Those who place it higher do not probably take into consideration how decidedly the author rejects the Epistle to the Hebrews, as the disputes respecting it were first expressly turned to its prejudice by Gaius, the Roman Presbyter. Some indeed have held Gaius or Caius to be the author of the catalogue. It contains the four Gospels, the Acts and thirteen Epistles of Paul. That to the Hebrews he maintains to be the production of an Alexandrian of the Marcionite sect. He mentions, besides, the Epistle of Jude and two of John's with his Apocalypse. He then, however, adds the Wisdom of Solomon and the Revelation of Peter, apparently as christian Scriptures.

His procedure in regard to Peter is really remarkable. He omits his first Epistle, respecting which there was not a doubt in all antiquity, and speaks of his Apocalypse instead. Such a mistake must not pass without closer examination.

This ancient fragment has come down to us through a barbarous copyist, and evidently not in its original language, but in a version which is not nearly so good as that of Irenaeus. In many places a glimmer of the Greek text which was its basis is perceptible.<sup>2</sup> With this supposition, let us examine more attentively the words used in speaking of Peter and his Apocalypse. His language is "Epistola sane Judae et superscriptae Johannis duae in Catholica habentur. Et sapientia ab amicis Salomonis in honorem ipsius scripta. Apocalypsis etiam Johannis et Petri tantum recipimus, quam quidam ex nostris legi in ecclesia nolunt."

I imagine that we ought to punctuate thus : "Epistola sane Judae et superscriptae Johannis duae in Catholica habentur, et sapientia Salomonis in honorem ipsius scripta, apocalypsis etiam Johannis. Et Petri tantum," etc.

If we connect "Apocalypsis etiam Johannis et Petri" together, I do not see how he could say "*tantum* recipimus"—we receive only two

<sup>1</sup> Its other significations, as e. g., a church-regulation, a catalogue of holy utensils, etc., may be seen in Cave Dissert. II. in Append. ad Hist. Litt. Suicer Thesaurus Philol. V. *Κανόν*.—Zonaras in Ep. Iman Canon. Basilii et Amphiloeh. c. 6.

<sup>2</sup> Muratori. Antiqq. Ital. Med. Aev. T. III. p. 854. Such a passage, e. g., is the following : "Sic enim non solum visorem, etc." οὕτως γὰρ οὐ μόνον θεατὴν, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἀκουστὴν τε καὶ γραμματέα πάντων θαυμασίων τοῦ κυρίου καθ' ἑξῆς ἐάντων ὁμολογεῖ. The most difficult passage is "Acta autem omnium apostolorum sub uno libro scripta sunt Lucas optime Theophile comprehendit, qui sub presentia ejus singula gerebantur, sicut et semote passionem Petri evidenter declarat, sed protectionem Pauli ab urbe ad Spaniam proficiscentis." If we turn it into Greek it is plain : Τὰς δὲ πράξεις ἀπάντων τῶν ἀποστόλων γραφείσας εἰς μίαν βίβλον Λουκᾶς τῷ κρατίστῳ Θεοφίλῳ συνέκλεισε, ὅτι κατὰ μέρος ἐν τῇ αὐτοῦ παρουσίᾳ ἐγενήθησαν, καθὼς, παρεκτός τοῦ Πέτρου παθήματος, σαφῶς ἐμφανίζει, καὶ τῆς ἐπιδημίας Παύλου ἀπὸ τῆς πόλεως εἰς τὰς Σπανίας ἐπιδημοῦντος.



Apocalypses—one was enough. Or, if *tantum recipimus* expresses an inferior degree of respect, yet it relates only to Peter and his Apocalypse, as the further explanation of *tantum recipimus* shows; *quam*, which, being in the singular number and referring only to one, i. e. the last mentioned Apocalypse. Thus a period must certainly be placed after *apocalypsis etiam Johannis*.

Let us now take the words thus, and then turn the incomprehensible *et Petri tantum recipimus* into Greek: καὶ Πέτρου μόνον παραδεχόμεθα. Now by changing μόνον to μόνην we obtain good sense and have the first Epistle of Peter, which is wanting in the catalogue. He has been speaking of the Catholic Epistles and now says: καὶ Πέτρου μόνην παραδεχόμεθα—and of Peter we receive only one. Now, however, the other clause is not consistent with this, unless it be worded thus: *alteram quidam ex nostris legi in ecclesia nolunt*. But if we turn it into Greek, we shall soon see how he obtained his *quam quidam ex nostris* and that he had at the bottom the sense suggested: καὶ Πέτρου μόνην παραδεχόμεθα, ἥς παρ' ἑτέροις ἡμῶν ἀναγινώσκεισθαι ἐν ἐκκλησίᾳ οὐ θέλουσι. Thus, instead of Peter's Apocalypse, we have the first Epistle of Peter together with the second, which last is disputed by some.

He omits the Epistle of James, as did many of that period. He admits only two of John's among the Catholic Epistles; yet it is to be observed that, as we shall see in the proper place, there is some evidence that the occidental nations considered the 2d Epistle as merely a post-script to the first. If this were really the case, that which is now the third must have been regarded by them as the second.

Origen's Catalogue ranks next in point of antiquity. This is found in his Homilies on Joshua, where he gives an allegorical interpretation of the trumpets blown before Jericho. The first of the Evangelists who blew the trumpet, says he, was Matthew, then Mark, and then John. Peter blew it in two Epistles; so too James and Jude. John began his blast anew with his Epistle and the Apocalypse; and Luke with his Acts of the Apostles. Lastly, however, Paul drowned the sound of all the rest with his fourteen-fold blast. Compare with this another catalogue by the same writer, preserved by Eusebius (*Hist. Eccles.* 6: 25), in which he gives us to understand that opinions were various respecting the 2d of Peter and the 2d and 3d of John. He has made too, in another place, a similar remark respecting the Epistle of James.

Of at least as early date as that of Origen, is the Canon of the Syriac church, which we derive from their oldest version. It comprehends the Gospels, Acts, and fourteen Epistles of Paul—of the Catholic Epistles it contains that of James, the first of Peter, and of John,—and, as I think, the Apocalypse.

It is observable that the Syrians have incorporated with their version the Epistle of James, which does not occur in the Roman catalogue. This confirms the fact of the influence of geographical circumstances. Syria must, from its situation, have become acquainted with the Epistle of James earlier, and have been sooner and better informed as to its author, than other countries.

## § 20.

The statements of Eusebius are especially worthy of our attention, inasmuch as he has not only given us the catalogue of his church, as others have done, but has presented for our survey a historical view of the public decisions of various churches and the individual opinions of ecclesiastical writers.

The principal passage is in the 3d book of his Church-history, chap. 25th, in explanation of which the 3d and 24th chapters of the 3d book may be consulted.<sup>1</sup>

He drew up this sketch of public and private opinions respecting the Scriptures of the New Testament under the guidance of *ecclesiastical tradition*, κατὰ τὴν ἐκκλησιαστικὴν παράδοσιν (III. 25); under which he included παράδοσιν ἄγραφον (III. 39.), or oral information, ἔγγραφον, written communication, or δι' ὑπομνημάτων, by means of monuments (IV. 21, and 37.), and lastly ἀρχαίου ἔθους παράδοσιν, ancient custom, or authentic church-usage, (V. 23, 24.)

From these materials he formed his collection. He states the established usage of the church (II. 23. III. 31.), and always extracts the individual opinions of the fathers respecting certain scriptures from their works, treating particularly of their circumstances in life, their merits and labors,—observing, in passing to the principal passage, that he intends to bring forward the testimonies of the ancients on this subject individually down to his time. (III. 24.)

This is clear from the very character of the catalogue. In it he promises to speak more fully in its place of the varieties of opinion concerning the Apocalypse, which are here only hinted at. He says that even the rejected books have ever been esteemed genuine by many, γνώριμα τοῖς πολλοῖς. He distinguishes two opinions respecting the 2d and 3d of John; one of which attributed them to the Evangelist, and the other to another John. He notices also the variety of opinion among Christians respecting the Gospel of the Hebrews. The controverted Scriptures, he says further on, are yet known to most teachers in the church: παρὰ πλείστοις τῶν ἐκκλησιαστικῶν γινωσκόμενας. The expression πλείστοις ἐκκλησιαστικῶν, respecting the meaning of which all are not agreed,<sup>2</sup> is elliptical, and must be filled out by ἀνδρῶν, as we are informed by Eusebius; for he has done this in the next

<sup>1</sup> An explanation of these passages has been attempted by many learned men for various purposes. Chr. Fred. Weber, "Prüfung der Hauptstelle des Eusebius, vom Kanon," in the *addenda* to the "Geschichte des N. T. Kanons, Tub. 1791."—Joh. Ern. Chr. Schmidt on the Canon of Eusebius in Henke's "Magazin für Religionsphilosophie." 5th Bd. 3d St.—Carl. Christ. Flatt, on the Canon of Eusebius, in the "Magazin für Christl. Dogmat. und Moral." 7th und 8th St. These writings Paul Joach. Sigism. Vogel has digested and reviewed in his *Commentationis de Canone Eusebiano Pars. I. Erlang. 1809. Pars. II. 1810. Pars. III. 1811.* The most recent work on this subject, is Fred. Lücke. "Ueber den Neutestamentl. Kanon des Eusebius. Berlin 1816."

<sup>2</sup> Vogel (*Comment. de Can. Euseb. pars. I. p. 8.*) thinks ἐκκλησιαστικοί to mean here, *Christiani Catholici*, because Euseb. elsewhere subjoins συγγραφέντες. Yet the πλείστοι ὅσοι τῶν ἐκκλησιαστικῶν (III. 39.), are certainly teachers. Even in II. 25. where Du Valois takes the meaning to be *Catholicus*, a *writer* is meant.

clause : τῶν κατὰ διαδοχὰς ἐκκλησιαστικῶν τις ἀνὴρ, from which we see likewise that they were employed in the office of the ministry.

These expressions, taken together, show that, as we said in the beginning, this is not a catalogue of a single party, but a sketch of public decisions, the individual opinions of teachers, from various sources. It was his object, after enumerating the books which were universally acknowledged, to give a general view of the past and present opinions as to certain books, nearly as far down as the great Nicene Council.

In this catalogue is comprehended, if not wholly, at least to a great extent, the various traditions by means of documents, inasmuch as he had before him the literary productions of antiquity from Africa, Asia, Greece Proper, and even from the Latin churches. On the other hand, what he says of church-usage, must have been drawn from more limited knowledge. The usage of individual churches could not be learnt so well from any writings, as from attentive observation of circumstances and intercourse with neighboring contemporaries in the ministry. Hence the statements on this subject seem to have reference to Asia merely. So much respecting the design of the historian and the aids which he employed in its execution. Now as to the actual execution.

Eusebius has been speaking of the writings of the Apostles ; then of the Gospels, and John's writings in particular. (III. 24.) Led on by his train of remark, he resolves (III. 25.) to enumerate in their order, from the beginning, the books of the New Testament of which he has just spoken, τὰς δηλωθεῖσας γραφάς.<sup>1</sup>

In order to elucidate this catalogue thus executed, we will first notice the technical language of the ancients as to things of this kind ; that is to say, the usual phrases and expressions of Grecian criticism. A genuine work is called γνήσιον σίγγραμμα : the Greeks say too, ὁμολογεῖται αὐτοῦ εἶναι for it is this or that author's. The opposite of the γνήσιον was the κίβδηλον, the ὑποβολιμαῖον, the νόθον. The designations ἀμφισβητεῖται, διστάζεται, ἀμφιβάλλεται and ἀμφεδοξεῖται ὁ διάλογος, ἡ γραφή, are intermediate expressions. By these words they denoted a division into the *decidedly genuine*, the *decidedly spurious*, and *those respecting which opinions differ*. There is no fourth member of the division, and if the Christians possessed a peculiar species of writings, it of course could not fall under these heads. Origen, the first ecclesiastical writer extant in whom we find a classification, notices these three divisions into γνήσιον, νόθον, μικτόν,<sup>2</sup> *genuine*, *spurious*, and *mixed*, i. e. what some held genuine, others spurious.

<sup>1</sup> Eusebius intends nothing more by δηλωθεῖσας γραφάς than writings which had just been spoken of, the Scriptures before mentioned. As it has been supposed, that there is something peculiar in the expression, ( Vogel Comment. de Can. Euseb. pars I. p. 4.—Lücke über den Neutestamentl. Kanon. p. 9.) I must fortify my interpretation. Eusebius uses this expression in the same way respecting Josephus' Antiquities, which had been before cited, (I. 8.) ταῦτα μὲν οὖν ἐν τῇ δηλωθείσῃ γραφῇ, and likewise (I. 9) κατὰ τὴν δηλωθεῖσαν αὐτοῦ γραφὴν ; and further on, (II. 7.) after speaking of Philo's book, περὶ βίου θεωρητικοῦ, he says at the end : " This may be seen ἐκ τῆς δηλωθεῖσας τοῦ ἀνδρὸς ἱστορίας. (IV. 14.) ἐν τῇ δηλωθείσῃ γραφῇ. (V. 4.) ἐν τῇ δηλωθείσῃ γραφῇ. (III. 35.) τὸν δηλωθέντα τρόπον. (IV. 1.) ὁ δηλωθεὶς ἐπίσκοπος, &c.

<sup>2</sup> Comment. in Joan. To. 13. Vol. IV. p. 226. He asks Heracleon, who had quoted the κήρυγμα Πέτρου : ποτερὸν ποτε γνήσιόν ἐστιν, ἢ νόθον, ἢ μικτόν ?



Eusebius pays deference to the *usus loquendi*, in the expressions γνήσιον or ὁμολογούμενον and νόθον: for the middle member of the division, he selects ἀντιλεγόμενον. According to the custom of profane critics, Eusebius recognizes only three gradations or classes. Respecting these, no doubt would ever have arisen, were he not chargeable soon after with confusion in his language or in his sense. Let us first, however, examine the Catalogue, before we meddle with its termination.

He distributes all the books, then, which really belong to the Apostles, or have been aspirants to the honor, under three titles: ὁμολογούμενα, acknowledged; ἀντιλεγόμενα, against which doubts are prevalent; νόθα, which make unfounded pretensions to be ranked among the apostolical works, or rather are ranked by the ignorant among them.

In the first division of the Homologoumena, he includes the four Gospels, the Acts of the Apostles, the Epistles of Paul, the first of John and Peter. To these, he further says, may be added, if thought fit, the Apocalypse.

In the second division, the disputed books, he classes the Epistle of James, of Jude, the 2d of Peter, and the 2d and 3d of John.

To the third division, he assigns the *Acta Pauli*, the Shepherd, Peter's Apocalypse, the Epistle of Barnabas, and the Instructions of the Apostles. Here too, he adds, John's Apocalypse may be inserted by any one who thinks fit; for some reject it, others place it among the acknowledged books. Some have reckoned the Gospel of the Hebrews also among these, and it is most ardently revered by converts from Judaism.

Let us now examine each class in its order, and consider attentively each of the writers' expressions.

The ὁμολογούμενα are writings that are really authentic, not counterfeit, ἀληθεῖς καὶ ἀπλοστοί, and as he expresses himself in passing to this passage, the genuine writings, γνήσια γράφαί, of those authors, whose names they bear, writings respecting which the ancients had no doubt, (III. 24.) and which the fathers of old have quoted in their works as undoubted: οἷς—οἱ πάλαι πρεσβύτεροι ὡς ἀναμφίλεκτοις, ἐν τοῖς σφῶν αὐτῶν κατακέχρηται συγγραμμάσι. (III. 3.)

The ἀντιλεγόμενα are writings known to *most* men in the ministry, παρὰ πλείστοις τῶν ἐκκλησιαστικῶν, and by *many* regarded as genuine, γνώριμα πολλοῖς. (III. 25.)<sup>1</sup> Their want of historical evidence prevents their being universally acknowledged; for they have been mentioned by but few of the old fathers in their works: οὐ πολλοὶ τῶν παλαιῶν αὐτῶν ἐμνημόνευσαν. (II. 23.) As respects church-usage, they were in *most* churches publicly read like other sacred books; μετὰ τῶν λοιπῶν ἐν πλείστοις ΔΕΔΗΜΟΣΙΕΥΜΕΝΑ ἐκκλησίαις (II. 23.)—ἐν πλείστοις ἐκκλησίαις παρὰ πολλοῖς ΔΕΔΗΜΟΣΙΕΥΜΕΝΑ. (III. 31.)

The νόθα are writings which are not to be entirely discarded, which were written by good men from good motives, but from their titles are likely to mislead people to regard them as apostolical works, to which

<sup>1</sup> This signification is affixed to the expression γνώριμος in Eusebius, III. 38. where he says of the 2d Epistle of Clement: οὐ μὲν ἔθ' ὁμοίως τῇ προτέρᾳ καὶ αὐτὴν γνώριμον ἐπιστάμεθα.

prerogative they have not so much as a doubtful claim; e. g. the *Acta Pauli, Apocalypsis Petri, Doctrinae Apostolorum, &c.* That this is the meaning of the historian, we see in the sequel, where he carefully distinguishes them from writings of heretics, under the name of Apostles, such as the Gospel of Peter, and of Thomas, the Acts of Andrew and John, and declares that the last are far from meriting a rank ἐν τοῖς νόθοις, and do not merit any classification, but are to be utterly rejected as presumptuous and impious stuff. Here we have a species of Christian literature, for which profane criticism has no peculiar denomination; and hence Eusebius found no place in his catalogue for books written by the heretics.<sup>1</sup>

We may now pass to some particular observations on the expressions of the historian. In the first class he names without any limitation the Epistles of Paul, and passes over in silence the disputes which have arisen respecting the Epistle to the Hebrews. Yet this fact did not escape the knowledge of the historian; for he elsewhere uses these words: "Fourteen Epistles of Paul are widely known and indubitable; yet it is to be remembered that some, τινές, have rejected the Epistle to the Hebrews, under the pretext that the church at Rome does not acknowledge it as one of Paul's writings." (III. 3.)

These *some* cannot have been Romans, as the whole church at Rome rejected it. The expression is much too limited, however, to admit of its denoting the Western Christians generally. Greeks were intended; but—as we may see from the observation prefixed, "*Fourteen Epistles of Paul are widely known and indubitable*,"—these *some* had no influence upon the opinion of the oriental and Greek churches. They were but individuals, and so insignificant, that the historian thought them not worthy of mention where he treated expressly of the canon.

Further, he places the Apocalypse in both the first and last class; each time with the words "whoever thinks fit,"—"for," he adds, "some reject it, others class it under the ὁμολογούμενα." Thus it more properly belonged to the second class, among the disputed writings. But the matter had not come to such a pass that the controversy could be laid aside, and the book classed among the disputed books, until a future generation should decide "*sine ira et studio*." For the contest, as Eusebius asserts elsewhere, was still kept up with zeal on both sides: ἐφ' ἐκάτερον ἔτι νῦν παρὰ τοῖς πολλοῖς περιέλεται ἡ δόξα. (H. E. III. 24.) But how could one party decide that it was generally acknowledged, a decision which could proceed only from all? Certainly they

<sup>1</sup> Hitherto Eusebius has carefully kept the various classes distinct and free from confusion. Yet it has been inferred from what he says of James' Epistle: ἰστέον δὲ ὡς νοθεύεται μὲν (II. 23), that he confounds the νόθα and ἀντιλεγόμενα. But νοθεύεται does not mean νόθον ἐστίν, but νόθον νομίζεται ὑπὸ τινων, which is equivalent to ἀντιλέγεται. See Eustath. in Odys. ψ. p. 1948. Ed. Rom: ἰστέον δὲ ὅτι κατὰ τὴν τῶν παλαιῶν ἱστορίαν Ἀριστάρχος καὶ Ἀριστοφάνης, οἱ κορυφαῖοι τῶν τότε γραμματικῶν, εἰς τὸ ὡς ἐρρήθη, ἀσπασίω—ἰκόντο: Od. ψ. 306, περαιοῦσι τὴν Ὀδυσσεϊάν, τὰ ἐφεξῆς ἕως τελοῖς νοθεύοντες. οἱ δὲ τοιοῦτοι πολλὰ τῶν καιριωτάτων περικόπτονσι, ὡς φασιν οἱ αὐτοῖς ἀντιπίπτοντες. The Scholia Codd. 15 and 37, on the Epistle of James, are relevant here, and likewise a similar one in Matthæi, which say in respect to the title: ἰστέον μὲν, ὡς τινες νοθεύουσι τὴν ἐπιστολὴν ταύτην, κ. τ. λ.

could not : and hence it must have been the case that the Apocalypse had been previously ranked among the Homologoumena, and its position had been menaced by recent attacks ; so that its supporters insisted upon this general acknowledgement, while its assailants disregarded it. Thus the matter really stood. Till the time of Nepos of Arsinoe, about the middle of the 3d century, it was universally revered as one of the Apostle's writings. In the II<sup>d</sup>. part, we have carefully and fully discussed the history of this book. The opponents of the Millennium, which Nepos defended from the Apocalypse, sought to rob him of this book, hoping in this way to disarm him, and ascribed its authorship to the heretic Cerinthus. Dionysius of Alexandria, who brought the controversy under his own cognisance, disapproved the bold position of the latter, but disarmed the Nepotians by an intermediate opinion. This was, that the Apocalypse was written by John ; not however the Apostle, but the Presbyter, whose grave was shown at Ephesus, near that of the Apostle. This supposition, set forth with several arguments, found currency among the Asiatics. It is elsewhere particularly mentioned by Eusebius. After speaking of the graves of the two Johns at Ephesus, he adds, "it is of consequence to pay attention to this ; for if the first John be not acknowledged as author of the Apocalypse which goes under his name, we must attribute it to the second." (H. E. III. 39.) Then its place would certainly be among the *ρόθα*, or writings of good men, erroneously numbered among the Apostolical productions.

He introduces also into the third class, the Gospel of the Hebrews. Among these, says he, "*some* have numbered the Gospel of the Hebrews, which is in special favor with those who have seceded from Judaism." The converts from Judaism were more especially pleased with it, and are distinguished from the *some* who are mentioned. The latter were not then Jewish Christians, but other members of the churches of Asia.

Yet the passage contains a difficulty, which directly involves the main question. Eusebius does indeed speak of the Gospel of the Hebrews in the third class, the *ρόθα* ; but immediately preceding are these words respecting the Apocalypse : "Some reject it, others place it among the *acknowledged*." Now when he proceeds : "Among these some reckon the Gospel to the Hebrews also," we may understand by *these*, either the acknowledged writings, *ὁμολογοίμενα*, or those of the third class, *ρόθα*. The difference between the two positions is material, and we cannot at first blush perceive any reason for a decision in favor of either.

Yet it would seem, that when the object is to make divisions into classes, the title of the class must be intended for the things ranged under it, and not a minor clause, which has accidentally got into the connexion. Besides, the words *καὶ πρὸς τοῦτοις, ἔτι τε, ἥδη δ' ἐν τοῦτοις*, all refer back to the title of the class *ἐν τοῖς νόθοις*. And further, it is to be remembered, that the *τινές*, (some,) could not in this case set up their opinion as a general acknowledgment, any more than in the case of the Apocalypse ; and this acknowledgment was absolutely requisite to give it a place in the first class. And if the general opinion had been in favor of it, and the *some* could appeal with reason to its general reception in answer to the opposing party, Eusebius would have



proceeded as he did with the Apocalypse, and have inserted this Gospel under both classes.

Had the historian concluded his account of the Canon here, we should find no difficulty in his general division. But now, after having clearly distinguished the ἀντιλεγόμενα and νόθα from each other, he concludes thus: All these belong to the disputed writings, ταῦτα μὲν πάντα τῶν ἀντιλεγομένων ἀνείη. Thus he annihilates the proposed division, and falls into another which confounds its two last members.

Further on we first meet with a clear exhibition of this division. In concluding his account of the age of the Apostles and their history, he mentions their writings once more in these words: "So much has come to our knowledge respecting themselves and the sacred Scriptures which they left behind them, and also respecting the disputed writings, ἀντιλεγομένων, from which we have distinguished the wholly spurious, παντελῶς νόθα, which deviate from the Apostolic doctrines." (III. 31.) Here the νόθα are those which deviate from pure doctrine; while, on the contrary, in the former division, such writings τῆς ἀληθοῦς ορθοδοξίας ἀπαρτίζουσαι, were not so much as deemed worthy of the third class, did not deserve even to be called νόθα; οὐδὲ ἐν τοῖς νόθοις αὐτὰ κατατακτέον.

When the heretical books, constituting a species of Christian literature which in profane criticism had no name or class, were notwithstanding introduced into one of these classes, the consequence of this erroneous proceeding was, that the genuine works of Christian writers were thrust forward into a better class, the Antilegomena; and thus two classes were thrown into one. This mode of division the historian wished to notice, and very injudiciously patched it on as the conclusion of his main passage respecting the Canon.

By a gross blunder, a third division is obscurely presented in III. 25; or rather, it was at first regarded as the principal division and then lost sight of. It is the division into ἐνδιαθήκους and οὐκ ἐνδιαθήκους, books belonging to the Testament, and books not belonging to it. He commences with the promise to notice the writings of the New Testament, τῆς καινῆς διαθήκης; but he soon wanders from his aim, and adds the ἀντιλεγόμενα and νόθα. Afterwards he recollects his first proposal, and excuses himself by saying, that he felt it necessary to enumerate the latter, though they did not belong to the New Testament. Had Eusebius used the requisite precision, he would first have distinguished the ἐνδιαθήκους and the οὐκ ἐνδιαθήκους; and then have subdivided the latter into ἀντιλεγόμενας and νόθας γραφάς. He would then have observed that there was also a division, according to which the heretical writings composed the third class, and the writings of orthodox fathers were elevated to a place among the doubtful Apostolical productions. For, plainly, he has referred to three wholly distinct divisions, which he found already made, and which he has confounded instead of explaining.

Hence, so long as we proceed in the explanation of this remarkable passage, upon the supposition that our aim must be to make these three classifications harmonize, or to throw light upon one from the other, we may employ ourselves forever without success.

## § 21.

Such, nearly, was the state of things previously to the great Nicene Council; for it was before this that Eusebius wrote his church-history. Not long after this convention of the Christian ministry, the public opinion was turned in favor of the books which the historian numbered among the ἀντιλεγόμενα; so much so, indeed, that the catalogues of Africa, Asia, and the western churches, overlooking this distinction as not existing, place them upon a level with the acknowledged Scriptures, and present different classifications. In respect to the Apocalypse alone, the favorite opinion of the Asiatics was yet too recent for them to desire or to be able to give it up immediately.

Cyril of Jerusalem enjoins it upon his disciples to read only the ὁμολογούμενα, leaving wholly untouched the ἀμειβαλλόμενα and ἀπόκρυφα.<sup>1</sup> In naming what parts of the New Testament should be read, he enumerates the Gospels, the Acts of the Apostles, fourteen Epistles of Paul, and seven Catholic Epistles; concluding with the repeated injunction: "only these should be read."<sup>2</sup> He does indeed still make use of the old terms of classification, but he admits under the ὁμολογούμενα, which alone were to be read, the ἀντιλεγόμενα of Eusebius, and omits the Apocalypse, according to the custom of many Asiatics of that period. Gregory Nazianzen expresses himself nearly in the same way in his Iambics;<sup>3</sup> as also the celebrated and much disputed Laodicean Canon.<sup>4</sup> Amphilochius alone recurs again to the old representation.<sup>5</sup>

Athanasius divides the books which, with various grounds of pretensions, aspired to canonical authority, into three classes; into κανονιζόμενα, really canonical writings, among which he reckons the Four Gospels, the Acts of the Apostles, fourteen Pauline and seven Catholic Epistles, and the Apocalypse; ἀναγινωσκόμενα, which are by consent read in the church, e. g. the *Instructions of the Apostles* and the *Shepherd*; and lastly, ἀπόκρυφα, under which term were comprehended all those writings which were forged under authoritative names or were otherwise of spurious origin.<sup>6</sup>

The Latins proceeded nearly in the same manner, according to the statement of Rufinus. They made three classes. The first comprehended the *Libros Canonicos*; the second those which were read with them, as the *Shepherd* and the *Judicium Petri*, which were called *Ecclesiastici*. The rest they too called *Apocryphos*.<sup>7</sup>

Whence now this change? The testimony of the fathers of preceding centuries on this subject always continued the same: as far as depended on these, there could be no change. The solution can be given only by the events of the period. True, the great Synod passed no or-

<sup>1</sup> Cyril. Cateches. IV. §33.

<sup>2</sup> Cyril. l. c. §36.

<sup>3</sup> Gregory Nazianz. Opp. T. II. p. 98.

<sup>4</sup> Spittler's "Kritische Untersuchung des 60sten Laodicenischen Kanons." Bremen. 1777.

<sup>5</sup> Inter Opp. Greg. Nazianz. T. II. p. 190.

<sup>6</sup> Fragment. Epistolae Festal.

<sup>7</sup> Ruffin. Exposit. in Symbol. Apost. c. 37. 38.

dinance or decree, to which this remarkable change can be ascribed; but the first convocation of teachers from all parts of the world, and the numerous councils which immediately followed it, afforded easy conference as to church-usages and ancient traditional regulations in respect to the Sacred Scriptures, as these usages and regulations had been preserved in the most distant parts of the Christian world. From mutual communication and comparison of usages, new and formerly unknown grounds of decision respecting the Canon might be obtained. In this way, notwithstanding the deficiency of testimony in the writings of the ancient fathers, and the doubt thence arising in regard to some of the Catholic Epistles, a satisfactory assurance might be obtained, by means of the evidence of traditional opinion and church-usage. The change which rapidly succeeded, its universality and uniformity in Asia, Africa and Europe, the period at which it happened, all point to this cause as the only one to which it can be attributed.

What degree of weight is to be accorded to the evidence of ancient usage and traditional public opinion, can be better determined by lawyers than theologians, for the latter ascribe different degrees of importance to them according to their respective creeds.

---

## CHAPTER IV.

### HISTORY OF THE TEXT. FIRST PERIOD.

#### § 22.

The fate which has befallen other works of antiquity, befel the New Testament likewise; the carelessness of the *librarii* caused errors in the transcripts, which gradually spread into a great number of copies. But this is not all; the New Testament has had the peculiar fate of suffering more by intentional alterations than the works of profane literature. It is inconceivable, when we reflect upon the reverence with which these writings were received, and the reputation of sanctity which they possessed, that such a thing could have happened; and yet it did, and the heretics, to whom it would perhaps be attributed, had no share in it.

There are indeed but few of them, to whom the orthodox fathers impute so malicious an act. And to these was opposed an uncommon vigilance in keeping their copies from the hands of the orthodox, and a general and powerful prejudice against them, over which such attempts, if made, could meet with little success. When a single trace of their criminality had been discovered, they were no longer allowed that justice which was their due; they were not trusted even when they were innocent. Marcion was often charged with wilful alterations of passages, which were read exactly so by some of the fathers, and are found thus in contemporary teachers of the dominant party.



Nevertheless, we meet with such phenomena in the New Testament at a very early period as contravene all our expectations. If we adopt, as our *terminus comparationis*, the unanimous text of several hundred manuscripts, which have reached our time, or that of the versions of the fourth century and of the writers who then and afterwards cite the New Testament, and compare with it the citations of the oldest fathers till the middle of the third century, we cannot deny that strange things had happened in individual MSS. even at this early period.

To give some proof of this beforehand, we will select a few citations from the writings of a father, who adorned this early period with his learning. I mean Clement of Alexandria, who complains within his days, of men who had made alterations in the Gospels, τῶν μετατιθέντων τὰ εὐαγγέλια. He supports his charge by the following example, which probably occurred in some MSS. after Matt. 5: 9; at least he has cited it in this connexion: μακάριοι οἱ δεδιωγμένοι ἀπὸ τῆς δικαιοσύνης, ὅτι αὐτοὶ ἔξουσιν τέλει· καὶ μακάριοι οἱ δεδιωγμένοι ἕνεκα ἐμοῦ ὅτι ἔξουσιν τόπον, ὅπου οὐ διωχθήσονται.<sup>1</sup>

Yet the MS. which he followed had several, if not so gross, yet important deviations. Among others he appeals to the following words of our Saviour: αἰτεῖτε τὰ μεγάλα, καὶ τὰ μικρὰ ὑμῖν προστεθήσεται, καὶ αἰτεῖτε τὰ ἐπουράνια, καὶ τὰ ἐπίγεια ὑμῖν προστεθήσεται. To leave no doubt in what connexion he read this, he refers to the same words in another place, where they occur in connexion with Matt. 6: 32, 33.<sup>2</sup>

In the passage, Matt. 10: 42, Clement read ποτήριον ψυχροῦ ὕδατος, and immediately after, instead of the words: ἀπωλέσῃ τὸν μισθὸν αὐτοῦ,—ἀπολήται ὁ μισθὸς αὐτοῦ.<sup>3</sup> There is but a single one in all our stock of MSS. which contains this reading.

A similar case occurs in Matt. 23: 27, οἵτινες ἔξωθεν μὲν φαίνονται ὠραῖοι, which Clement gives thus: ἔξωθεν ὁ τάφος φαίνεται ὠραῖος ἔσωθεν δὲ γέμει.<sup>4</sup> And Matt. 25: 41, εἰς τὸ πῦρ τὸ αἰώνιον; τὸ ἡτοιμασμένον, which is quoted in Clement, and also in Justin Martyr thus: εἰς τὸ πῦρ αἰώνιον ὃ ἡτοίμασεν ὁ πατήρ μου.<sup>5</sup> Of all the ancient MSS. there is only the one before mentioned, which coincides with these peculiarities.

Several such variations as these are observable in this writer; nor is he the only one who deviates from the text in this way. He has respectable and illustrious predecessors in this matter, such as Irenaeus, Justin Martyr, (as we have just seen in one instance,) and others, to whom the same observation is applicable, as we might soon be convinced by proofs.

We cease to be surprised at these facts, when we find Origen, at the close of this period, expressing himself as follows respecting the condition of the Gospels. "It might appear wrong" (he is speaking of Matt.

<sup>1</sup> Lib. IV. Strom. c. 6. near the end.

<sup>2</sup> Lib. I. Strom. c. 24. Origenes, De Orat. c. 2.

<sup>3</sup> Quis dives salvetur, c. 31.

<sup>4</sup> Paedagog. Lib. III. Edit. Sylburg et Heins. p. 241. Edit. Venet. Tom. I. p. 282.

<sup>5</sup> Cohortat. ad Gent. c. 9. Justin. Dialog. cum Tryphon. c. 76.

19: 19: ἀγαπήσεις τὸν πλησίον,) “to assert that these words are interpolated here, were it not that there is such a difference in many other places between the copies of the Gospels, that neither those of Matthew nor those of the other Evangelists agree together. The difference in MSS. has now,” he proceeds, “become really great, both from the carelessness of copyists, and also from the arbitrary conduct of those to whom is entrusted the correction of the copies; and further from emendations, additions and omissions, made by many according to their own judgment. In the copies of the Old Testament, indeed, we have, by the help of God, remedied this confusion, . . . . and have marked with an obelisk in the Septuagint what was wanting in the Hebrew, as we did not venture to reject it wholly; other passages we have added with an asterisk.”<sup>1</sup>

The ancients called the text of the Septuagint of the first period, the κοινὴ ἔκδοσις or *vulgaris editio*,<sup>2</sup> in which the private judgment and good pleasure of every reader and copyist assumed such unlimited scope, that finally stern necessity occasioned a revision of the text in various countries.

The expression is borrowed from the Alexandrian critics, by whom particularly the expressions κοινὴ ἔκδοσις, κοινὴ ἀνάγνωσις, often only κοινή, and also δημοτικὴ ἔκδοσις, were used respecting the old unrevised text of Homer, in contradistinction from the amended editions, διορθώσεις, of Aristarchus, Zenodotus, and others.<sup>3</sup> When the Version of the LXX had reached a state like that of the old Homeric text, the same critical denomination was applied to it likewise, in reference to Origen's revision.<sup>4</sup> Jerome made use of this term to designate the earlier corrupt text of the Latin versions of the Old and New Testaments, and renders κοινή by *communis*, and δημοτικὴ ἔκδοσις by *vulgata editio*.<sup>5</sup>

After shewing that the New Testament Scriptures were in a condition similar to the ancient state of Homer's works, or the Version of the LXX, we shall be justified in denominating this its condition until the revision which took place in the third century, the period of the κοινὴ ἔκδοσις.

<sup>1</sup> Καὶ εἰ μὲν μὴ καὶ περὶ ἄλλων πολλῶν διαφωνία ἦν πρὸς ἄλληλα τῶν ἀντιγραφῶν, ὥστε πάντα τὰ κατὰ Ματθαῖον μὴ συνάδειν ἀλλήλοις, ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ τὰ λοιπὰ εὐαγγέλια. . . . νῦν δὲ δηλονότι ἡ τῶν ἀντιγραφῶν διαφορὰ, εἴτε ἀπὸ ῥαθυμίας τινῶν γραφέων, εἴτε ἀπὸ τολμῆς τινῶν μοχθηρὰς τῆς διορθώσεως τῶν γραφομένων, εἴτε καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν τὰ ἑαυτοῖς δοκοῦντα ἐν τῇ διορθώσει προστιθέντων, ἡ ἀφαιρούντων. Τὴν μὲν οὖν ἐν τοῖς ἀντιγραφοῖς τῆς παλαιᾶς διαθήκης διαφωνίαν θεοῦ δίδοντας εἰρομεν ἰασάσθαι. . . . In Matt. Tom. XV. Vol. III. Ed. Ruei. p. 671. or Ed. Huetii Colon. p. 381.

<sup>2</sup> Hieronym. Ep. CVI. n. e. Ad Suniam et Fretellam. “Sed hoc interest inter utramque, quod κοινή pro locis et temporibus, et pro voluntate scriptorum vetus corrupta editio est.”

<sup>3</sup> Schol. in Il. B. 53. Ed. Wassenberg. Franeck. 1783. Schol. Ambrosian. in Odys. K. 74. Ed. Maii. Schol. Marcian. Vilfoison in Il. B. 169. P. 214. X. 468. Φ. 344.

<sup>4</sup> Hieron. ad Sun. et Fret. § 2. “Quam Origines et Caesariensis Eusebius, omnesque Graeciae tractatores, κοινήν, id est communem appellant atque vulgatam.”

<sup>5</sup> Hieron. L. cit. et Comment. in Matt. 13: 35. In Ep. ad Galat. 5: 24.

## § 23.

Now if we find among our literary stores any ancient MS. which deviates remarkably from the text of later times, and presents those readings which we have just extracted from Clement—which contains not only these and many others occurring in the writings of this father, but the variations and peculiarities of the oldest fathers generally, down to the third century, or at least a considerable part of them—may we not say, that it expresses the text of the period preceding any critical labors upon it, or in other words the *κοινή ἐκδοσις*?

Such an one we possess in the celebrated Cambridge MS. which contains the remarkable readings previously quoted from Clement. This too, almost alone, presents us in its text the various readings in all the most ancient fathers. In criticism it is called D, under which designation it appears in this work.

We will first establish the fact as to its text more fully, and then offer some remarks upon it. The former examples were taken from Matthew; the following are from the Gospel of Luke.

In the account of the baptism of Jesus, after the words: "This is my beloved Son in whom I am well pleased," (Luke 3: 22,) Clement adds: *ἐγὼ σήμερον γενένηκά σε*. . . Justin Martyr also<sup>1</sup> has this addition. The only manuscript which contains it is D. Luke 2: 49, *οὐκ ἤδειτε*, Irenaeus has cited in the Greek text,<sup>2</sup> which is extant in this passage, *οὐκ οἶδατε*; D likewise reads thus. According to Epiphanius, Marcion had in his copy in Luke 5: 14, *ἵνα εἰς μαρτύριον ᾗ ὑμῖν τοῦτο*. The father regarded this variation as having originated with the heretic; yet D reads precisely thus, and we may be the more certain that it is a genuine ancient reading, as Marcion's most zealous adversary had it in his own copy: "Itaque adjecit (Christus), ut sit vobis in testimonium sine dubio, quod testabatur, se legem non dissolvere, sed implere," etc.<sup>3</sup> There is as little ground for supposing that Marcion changed the words, (Luke 8: 42.) *ἐν δὲ τῷ ὑπάγειν* into *ἐγένετο ἐν τῷ ὑπάγειν*; for D and two other ancient MSS. read thus, and, besides, the Latin translators of this time found the same reading in the copies which they used. (*Cod. Veronens. Cod. Vercell. in Blanch. Evangel. Quadr.*) According to Epiphanius, he had likewise in Luke 8: 45, instead of *τίς ὁ ἀψάμενός μου*, the equivalent words *τίς με ἤψατο*, exactly like D and Origen. In Luke 9: 22, there stood in Marcion's copy, according to Epiphanius, instead of *τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ*,—*μετὰ τρεῖς ἡμέρας*. Tertullian read *μετὰ τὴν τρίτην ἡμέραν*, between the other two readings.<sup>4</sup> In Luke 24: 37, likewise, where Marcion read *φάντασμα θεωρεῖν*, instead of the difficult *πνεῦμα θεωρεῖν*, agreeing with the Codex D, there is no appearance of corruption. If the reading had been designed to favor the doctrine of the Phantasiasts, he must have altered or suppress-

<sup>1</sup> Clem. Paedagog. L. I. p. 92. Heinsii et Sylburg. p. 113. Venet. Justin. Dial. cum Tryph. c. 88.

<sup>2</sup> L. I. Advers. Haeres. c. 20. n. 2.

<sup>3</sup> Tertullian, Lib. IV. Adv. Marcion.

<sup>4</sup> Adv. Marcion. L. IV. c. 21.



ed the verses following, which he has not done.<sup>1</sup> But we cannot spend any more time upon the Marcionite readings, although they exhibit the characteristics of the text of this period. Very many of them occur in D, and no suspicion of intentional corruption can be defended.

In Luke 9: 60, Irenaeus has in the Greek:<sup>2</sup> *σὺ δὲ πορευθεὶς διάγγελλε*, with which D alone agrees; and v. 61, they again read alike:<sup>3</sup> *ἐπίτρεψον δέ μοι πρῶτον*. In v. 62, Clement has the following peculiar reading: *εἰς τὰ ὀπίσω βλέπον καὶ ἐπιβάλων τὴν χεῖρα αὐτοῦ ἐπ' ἄροτρον*,<sup>4</sup> which occurs in no MS. but D. Justin Martyr adds, after the words: *ὁ ἀθετῶν ὑμᾶς, ἐμὲ ἀθετεῖ*, (Luke 10: 16) the words: *ὁ δὲ ἐμοῦ ἀκούων, ἀκούει τοῦ ἀποστείλαντός με*, as in Hippolytus and in D.<sup>5</sup> Luke 12: 11 Clement has quoted thus: *ὅταν δὲ γέρουσιν εἰς τὰς, and μὴ προμεριμνᾶτε*; the *ἡ τί*, however, before *ἀπολογήσῃς*, he has omitted<sup>6</sup>—exactly as in D. The passage, Luke 12: 27: *πῶς αὐξάνει οὐ κοπιᾷ, οὐδὲ νήθει*, he gives thus: *πῶς οὔτε νήθει, οὔτε ὑφαίνει*<sup>7</sup>—exactly as it occurs in D alone. This MS. in Luke 12: 48, instead of: *περισσότερον αἰτήσουσιν αὐτόν*, has the words: *πλέον ἀπαιτήσουσιν αὐτόν*. From a free citation by Justin, we perceive that his text contained this variation; for he uses *πλέον ἀπαιτεθήσεται*, in which Clement coincides with him.<sup>8</sup> Instead of: *ἐν τῇ δευτέρᾳ καὶ τῇ τρίτῃ φυλακῇ*, (Luke 12: 38.) the Latin translator of Irenaeus reads: “Et si venerit in vespertina vigilia:”<sup>9</sup> we find the Greek exactly so in Marcion and in D: *τῇ ἐσπερινῇ φυλακῇ*. In Justin there occurs instead of *οἱ ἐργάται τῆς ἀδικίας* (Luke 13: 27.), *ἐργάται ἀνομίας*: so also in the second epistle of Clement of Rome, (if indeed it be his,) <sup>10</sup> and in the Codex D. Clement of Alexandria omits *ὑπό τινος* after *κληθῆς*, (Luke 14: 8.) and v. 10, for *πορευθεὶς ἀναπέσαι εἰς ἔσχατον τόπον*, he reads: *εἰς τὸν ἔσχατον τόπον ἀνάπιπτε*. Soon after (v. 16.) he says *δεῖπνον μέγαν*.<sup>11</sup> All this we find exactly so in D. In Luke 19: 5, *σήμερον γὰρ ἐν τῷ οἴκῳ* is expressed by Irenaeus, in the Greek fragments of his writings,<sup>12</sup> thus: *ὅτι σήμερον ἐν τῷ οἴκῳ*, which appears in no MS. but D. Clement says for *τῷ ἔχοντι δοθήσεται*, (Luke 19: 26.) *τῷ ἔχοντι προστιθήσεται*,<sup>13</sup> and D, *προστίθεται*. They alone exchange *δίδωμι* here for *προστίθμι*. In Luke 23: 46. MS. D and Justin Martyr<sup>14</sup> resemble each other in the words *παραιτήμι* and *παραιθεμαι*.

1 Tertull. L. IV. Adv. Marc. c. 42. 43. De carne Christi, c. 5.

2 L. I. Adv. Haer. c. 8. n. 3.

3 Iren. loc. cit.

4 L. VII. Strom. c. 16.

5 Justin. Apol. Major. c. 16. Hippolyt. de Charismat. c. 26. The Latin version of Irenaeus: Praef. ad Lib. III. Adv. Haeres.

6 Strom. L. IV. c. 9.

7 Paedagog. L. II. Sylb. 198. Venet. 231.

8 Justin. Apol. Maj. c. 17. Clem. Strom. L. II. c. ult.

9 L. V. Adv. Haeres. c. 34. n. 2.

10 Justin. Apol. Maj. c. 16. Clem. Rom. Ep. II. c. 4.

11 Paedagog. L. II. p. 141. Sylburg. and 165. Ed. Venet.

12 L. I. c. VIII. n. 3.

13 Strom. L. VII. c. 10.

14 Dial. cum Tryph. c. 105.

If we should bring into comparison here likewise the writings of Origen which he composed before any amended text existed, we should obtain a very great addition to the evidence for the position, that the Cambridge MS. preserves in its peculiarities the readings of the fathers of the Church before the middle of the third century.

It is therefore a copy of the *κοινὴ ἔκδοσις*; and its condition agrees with that picture which Origen has drawn of the text of this period, so that our position wants nothing as respects philological evidence.

The text was circulated in this state, until finally the necessity of a general emendation was perceived, and called forth in many places men who devoted themselves to this meritorious occupation. From this time the *vulgaris editio* gradually disappeared from the churches, from the desks of the readers, and from the hands of private persons; and posterity would have almost wholly lost it, had it not been preserved by the obstinacy of certain countries, in which laborious search has been made for it in later times. But we must not now proceed further in these investigations. We will first make use of the means we have of explaining in what way the orthodox, with perfectly honest intentions, and with all the reverence which they had for the sacred books, could have been the authors of such disorder in them.

### § 24.

The citations of the fathers would have left us very much in the dark respecting the history of the text during this period, had there not been preserved a MS. in which the alterations and accidents which it met with are laid before us, so as to be easily inspected. All we have to do, in order to delineate the rise of these alterations, is to make use of our eyes and then put together our observations. Errors of the copyist in writing must not be taken into account; for who could write their history? There are innumerable species of them, and there is no point of union from which we can consider them all at once.

I. It was an object of the readers of the Bible to make it as intelligible to themselves as possible. With this view, they often wrote, instead of an unintelligible expression, one more plain above the line or in the margin of their MS; for every body knows that this last is the place which readers have always appropriated to themselves for their own remarks. Such an obscure expression was, for example, to a Greek, the word *κῆνσος*, Mark, 12: 14; the genuine Greek word, *ἐπι κεφαλαῖον*, capitation-tax, was therefore placed by its side. This was afterwards introduced into the text by a transcriber, and so got into MS. D. Some one imagined Luke 12: 36, seq. to have reference to the day-time. Now the *τρίτη φυλακή*, according to the Greek reckoning, was the *μεσονύκτιον*; and in order to remedy the misapprehension which might arise, he explained the expression in accordance with the Roman custom, which divided the day in *quatuor excubias*, adding in the margin, *ἐσπερινῇ φυλακῇ*, which afterwards crept into several MSS. He must have been a person of some learning, who explained the words *τριακοντα ἀργύρια* in Matt. 26: 15, (which to Jews alone are precise and intelligible,) by *τριακοντα στατήρας*. This love of explanation shows itself in the valuable MS. D, not merely in single words,

but even in whole clauses. E. g. Mark 10: 12, *ἐὰν γινῇ ἀπολύσις τὸν ἄνδρα αὐτῆς* is so expressed as to be inconsistent with the customs of the Greeks, according to which *ἀπολύειν* and *ἀποπέμπειν* were used only of the man, while *ἀπολείπειν*, *discedere*, merely, was allowed to the woman, she being permitted to give the *ἀπολείψεως γράμμα*. Hence the *vulgaris editio* altered this clause according to the Greek customs: *γυνὴ ἐὰν ἐξέλθῃ ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀνδρὸς καὶ γαμήσῃ*. The phraseology, *ζητοῦντες θεοεὐχαί τι ἐκ τοῦ στόματος αὐτοῦ, ἵνα κατηγορ.* . . Luke 11: 54, was too foreign to be generally understood; some person therefore substituted one more plain: *ζητοῦντες ἀγορεύειν τινα λαβεῖν αὐτοῦ, ἵνα εἰρώσι κατηγορήσαι αὐτοῦ*. Such explanations, however, sometimes succeeded but ill; e. g. Luke 13: 11, where the oriental expression: *πνεῦμα ἔχουσα ἀσθενείας*, was forced to make way for the infelicitous explanation: *ἐν ἀσθενείᾳ ἦν τοῦ πνεύματος*. The alterations which arose in the text, from the aim to render it more intelligible, are seen in great numbers in our MS. of the *vulgaris editio*, and are found in cases which could present no difficulty to a reader who could make even moderate pretensions to understanding.

II. The many Hebraisms which constitute one peculiarity of the New Testament could not count upon the approbation of Greek grammarians. Such difficult applications of words and foreign arrangement of the parts of speech, could not but occasion criticism among a people who were very much inclined to it, and laid great stress on purity of diction. Hence Luke 20: 11, *προσέθετο πέμψαι, πᾶσι ἡρι,* was altered to *ἐπέμψεν*, and Mark 2: 15, *ἐν τῷ κατακεῖσθαι αὐτόν*, into *κατακειμένων αὐτῶν*; and John 11: 33, *ἐνέβριμ. τῷ πνεύμ. καὶ ἐτάραξεν ἑαυτόν*, into *ἐταράχθη τῷ πνεύματι ὡς ἐμβριμώμενος*. Thus, too, the rough Jewish construction *ἐπεὶ δὲ ἐπλήρωσε πάντα τὰ ῥήματα αὐτοῦ εἰς τὰς ἀκοὰς τοῦ λαοῦ, εἰσῆλθεν εἰς Καπερναούμ*, (Luke 7: 1.) was exchanged for the easy Greek sentence: *ὅτε ἐτέλεσεν πάντα τὰ ῥήματα λαλῶν, ἦλθεν εἰς Καφερ.*

Numerous as are the cases of this kind in the *κοινὴ ἔκδοσις*, it is nevertheless true that it contains many Hebraisms which were afterwards extirpated by those who in the third century, with similar views and critical penetration, accomplished recensions of the text. I will present some proofs of this important remark. The later text reads, Mark 14: 25, *οὐκέτι οὐ μὴ πίω*, where D still has *προσθῶ πίνειν*—Luke 12: 10, D reads: *ἀφελήσεται αὐτῷ, εἰς δὲ τὸ πνεῦμα ἅγιον οὐκ ἀφελήσεται*, while the later text has: *ἀφελήσεται αὐτῷ· τὸ δὲ εἰς τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα βλασφημήσαντι οὐκ ἀφελήσεται*. And John 9: 11, *ἀπῆλθον οὖν καὶ ἐνιψάμεν, καὶ ἦλθον βλέπων*, while the later text reads: *ἀπελθὼν καὶ νιψάμενος ἀνέβλεπα*.

III. Others labored in a different way to make the text plainer, or to give it greater circumstantiality, writing the language of one Evangelist respecting an occurrence in the margin of another. The intention was to illustrate the text in this way, but by degrees the notes finally got into the text itself. This is too well known to require examples for proof; but I will give a single one on account of its peculiar absurdity. In Mark 13: 2, where our Lord speaks of the coming desolation, and says that one stone shall not be left upon another, the *κοινὴ ἔκδοσις* proceeds: *καὶ διὰ τριῶν ἡμέρων ἄλλος ἀναστήσεται ἄνευ χειρῶν*.



The words thus joined to ὅς οὐ μὴ καταλυθῇ, are evidently the substance of John 2: 19.

Further, when the Old Testament was quoted in the New rather freely and not so as to give the complete import of the passage, readers were in the habit of adding the very language of the prophets, or that part of it which was wanting. E. g. Matt. 13. 14, where to the citation ἀκοῇ ἀκούσετε, Isaiah's introduction to these words (6: 9), πορεύετε, καὶ εἰπὲ τῷ λαῷ τοῦτῳ, was subjoined.

IV. It is most probable too that the Harmonies occasioned considerable corruption of the text. The method in which Tatian brought together the four Gospels is but little known; nor is it certain whether we really possess the plan of Ammonius through Victor Capuanus or not. The κοινὴ ἔκδοσις sometimes contains passages in which the text of several Evangelists is so jumbled together, that we cannot but think it to be the artificial arrangement of some harmonist. By such combination, a narration frequently obtained a minuteness of detail, which induced some diligent reader to write it down for the sake of illustration in the margin of his New Testament. When once there, the next transcriber of the copy did it the honor of introducing it into the text itself. Thus I account for the remarkable form which Luke 5: 19. has obtained in the MS. D: καὶ ἀποστεγάζαντες τοὺς κεράμους, ὅπου ἦν, καθῆκαν τὸν κράββατον σὺν τῷ παραλυτικῷ. The ἀποστεγάζαντες is from Mark 2: 4. ἀποστέγασαν τὴν σιέγην. But the harmonist joined with Mark's verb, instead of σιέγη, the κεράμους of Luke. From Mark he took further ὅπου ἦν and κράββατος, and the expression καθῆκαν was borrowed from Luke. In Luke are found the words: σὺν τῷ κλινιδίῳ: but as there was a κράββατος already there, the παραλυτικός of Mark took the place of κλινίδιον, and thus arose σὺν τῷ παραλυτικῷ, and the whole becomes as we find it in this MS. The passage Matt. 27: 28: ἐνδύσαντες αὐτόν, ἱμάτιον πορφυροῦν καὶ χλαμύδα κοκκίνην περιεθίκαν αὐτῷ has been treated in a similar manner. Mark (15: 17) has πορφύραν, Luke (23: 2), ἐσθῆτα; but John unites both in ἱμάτιον πορφυροῦν. (19: 2.) Mark supplied ἐνδύουσιν, which, however, was moulded into the form of Matthew's ἐκδύσαντες; and the latter furnished the χλαμύδα κοκκίνην. Now the supposed harmony of Ammonius gave this passage in the same way, according to Victor: "Et exuentes eum, induunt tunicam purpuream, et chlamydem coccineam circumdederunt ei."<sup>1</sup> In thus inferring from the state of the text in particular places, that it originated out of the arrangement of some harmonist, we are supported by other facts. The Genealogy of Matthew, which in MS. D is altered according to that by Luke, betrays an attempt of the kind to unite the two. The famous interpolation of MS. D in Matt. 20: 28, which in respect to magnitude has not its equal, sprang, it would seem, from such a source. Its substance seems to be in Luke 16: 8; but it is given with peculiar freedom and in an extended form. That it stood in some connexion with other precepts of Jesus, which were brought together on account of their similarity, is evident from the first clause, which is not borrowed from Luke, but from some

<sup>1</sup> Ammonii Alexand. Sanctior. Quatuor Evangel. Harmonia. Interpr. Victore Episc. Capuano, c. CLXIX. Galland. Biblioth. Patr. Tom. II.

other source : *ὕμεις δὲ ζητεῖτε ἐκ μικροῦ αὐξῆσαι καὶ ἐκ μείζονος ἔ-  
λαττον εἶναι.* From this introduction, it would seem to have been con-  
nected with those discourses of our Lord in which he speaks to his  
disciples respecting comparative greatness, as he did on several occa-  
sions. If this be the case, it is no longer doubtful that it was taken  
from some paraphrastic harmony.

V. Sometimes an individual found a passage or story in the apocry-  
phal books which pleased him, and he wrote it in some suitable place  
on the blank space in his copy. It only needed some ignorant *librarius*  
to insert it in the next copy which was taken of the former. Thus was  
introduced the story in Luke 6: 5: *τῇ αὐτῇ ἡμέρᾳ θεασάμενός τινα  
ἐργαζόμενον τῷ σαββάτῳ, εἶπεν αὐτῷ "Ἄνθρωπε, εἰ μὲν οἶδας τί  
ποιεῖς, μακάριος εἶ, εἰ δὲ μὴ οἶδας, ἐπικατάρατος καὶ παραβάτης εἶ  
τοῦ νόμου.* To this, probably, a passage in Justin Martyr is to be as-  
cribed : *ταῦτα γὰρ τεκτονικὰ ἔργα εἰργάζετο, ἐν ἀνθρώποις ὧν, ἀρό-  
τρια καὶ ξυγά, διὰ τούτων καὶ τῆς δικαιοσύνης σύμβολα διδάσκων, καὶ  
ἐνεργῇ βίον.*<sup>1</sup> It came into his text from the *Evangelium infantiae  
Christi*. Stroth, who attempted to derive it from the Gospel of the He-  
brews,<sup>2</sup> did not consider that that book commenced with the baptism of  
our Lord, and thus did not contain the history of his youth.

VI. The custom of reading these books in the public assemblies,  
frequently procured them an addition by a foreign hand. It was neces-  
sary to divide them into stated sections for reading ; these sections sep-  
arated particular narratives from their connexion, causing the church-  
lessons to begin too abruptly. In order to avoid this inconvenience, an  
introduction was framed, which the reader wrote in the church-copies  
for his own use. In this way interpolations or smaller alterations of the  
text arose in great numbers, the occasion and origin of which may be  
easily discerned, if pains be only taken to examine whether the suspect-  
ed passage was the beginning of an Anagnosis. I will not accumulate  
examples on a point which has long since ceased to be doubtful. At  
Luke 16: 19, an Anagnosis began with the words : *ἄνθρωπος δὲ τις  
ἦν πλούσιος.* The commencement was too abrupt ; therefore the words :  
*εἶπεν δὲ καὶ ἕτεραν παραβολὴν,* as we find them yet in the text of D,  
were prefixed to the narrative. Compare Luke 12: 2, where an Anag-  
nosis began with : *οὐδὲν δὲ συγκεκαλυμμένον,* and observe how the *κοι-  
νὴ ἔκδοσις* has formed an introduction from the preceding verses : *ἐν  
οἷς ἐπισυναχ. . .* Another section commenced at John 14: 1, with *μὴ  
ταρασσέσθαι. . .* to which the formula : *καὶ εἶπεν τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐ-  
τοῦ,* was prefixed. Sometimes a conclusion was affixed to a lesson,  
when it seemed too abruptly broken off. One of these ends in D at  
Luke 6: 10, with the words : *καὶ ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς ὅτι κύριός ἐστιν ὁ υἱ-  
ὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου καὶ τοῦ σαββάτου,* which is taken entirely from an-  
other place.

VII. Another species of alterations are omissions ; we speak here,  
however, only of those which bear the marks of intentional disfiguration.  
As it was frequently the case, that glosses and explanatory marginal  
annotations crept wrongfully into the text, the Diorthotae or correctors

<sup>1</sup> Justin Mart. Dial. cum Tryph. c. 88.

<sup>2</sup> Repert. für bibl. und morgenl. Litteratur. I. Th.

of the MSS. often indulged suspicions in regard to such expressions or sentences, judging of them perhaps according to their own critical notions. They then exercised their supposed right in respect to them, and either struck them out, or affixed marks of rejection to them. In Matt. 13: 1, ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνῃ ἐξεληθὼν ὁ Ἰησοῦς, the expression ἀπὸ τῆς οἰκίας appeared superfluous and merely a gloss, and therefore was rejected from the κοινὴ ἔκδοσις. No less useless in Matt. 22: 24, was τὴν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ following ἐπιγαμβρεύσει ὁ ἀδελφὸς αὐτοῦ. The word ἐπιγαμ. includes this, and ἀναστήσει σπέρμα sufficiently confirms it; therefore τὴν γυν. αὐτ. was suppressed. In Mark 15: 24, τίς τί ἄρη is implied by the preceding βάλλοντες κληῖρον ἐπ' αὐτὰ; it was therefore omitted in the κοινὴ ἔκδοσις.

VIII. Another cause very similar to the last, often gave rise to rejections. Synonymous expressions or phrases immediately following one another were imperfections in Greek construction with which no good writer would be chargeable without peculiar reasons. A reader or corrector who judged merely as a Greek, and knew not the peculiar structure and usages of the Hebrew language, would deem himself indisputably authorized by the grammatical laws of his nation, to strike out one of two synonymous phrases from the text as a scholion. So it happened in Mark 8: 15, where the first of the two equivalent words ὁράτε, βλέπετε, was struck out; and Mark 11: 28, where ἐν ποίᾳ ἔξουσίᾳ ταῦτα ποιεῖς, and the words immediately following, καὶ τίς σοι τὴν ἔξουσίαν ταύτην ἔδωκεν, mean nearly the same thing: hence sentence of rejection was passed upon the latter clause. In Luke 21: 15, δυνήσονται ἀντειπεῖν ἢ ἀντιστῆναι,—αντειπεῖν was expressed by ἀντιστῆναι, and therefore was omitted. In John 10: 18, the words: ἀλλ' ἐγὼ τίθηναι αὐτὴν ἀπ' ἐμαυτοῦ, appeared to be contained both in the preceding and following clauses, and were therefore omitted as tautological.

Such are the various facts which the MS. D presents to our observation, on which we may found a sketch of the fate of the text during the period of the κοινὴ ἔκδοσις, and by which we may elucidate that part of its history which the torch of criticism has hitherto only feebly illumined.

## § 25

Yet our idea of the κοινὴ ἔκδοσις would be very inaccurate, did we expect to find all the corruptions to which it was exposed exhibited together in a single MS. Its lot must have been different in every province, in every *decennium*, and in every house. It was not the case that every thing which an industrious and acute or incompetent reader added to his MS., and the alterations he made in particular passages, found their way into all the copies and were spread abroad to all places and persons. Such scholia and alterations frequently did not pass the threshold of their birth-place and perished with the MS.; while on the other hand, others were extended further by means of copies, and in other hands received fresh additions. What Jerome says of the condition of the Septuagint, is applicable here: "*κοινή pro locis et temporibus et pro voluntate scriptorum vetus corrupta est.*" Though we have drawn



the various classes of corruptions from D, yet we must not expect to find in this MS. all the particular cases which may be arranged under them. Other copies had many, which we seek in vain in this. Irenaeus, for example, read in his copy for ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν, in Matt. 10: 29, the words εἰς τὴν παγίδα. He comments expressly upon it: "Si quis, quod dictum est . . . enumerare voluerit captos ubique passeret . . . et causam requirere, ob quam heri tanti, . . . hodie iterum tanti capti sint," &c.<sup>1</sup> This reading occurs frequently in Origen also, and in other writers; but it is wanting in the MS. D. Justin has quoted Matt. 19: 17, as follows: εἰς ἔστιν ἀγαθὸς ὁ πατὴρ ὁ ἐν οὐρανοῖς;<sup>2</sup> Irenaeus also read it in his copy: ὁ πατὴρ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς;<sup>3</sup> &c. The passage Matt. 7: 22, appears still more remarkable, as Justin read it: πολλοὶ ἐροῦσί μοι κύριε, ἐν τῷ σὺν ὀνόματι ἐξαγομεν, καὶ ἐπίομεν, καὶ δυνάμεις ἐποιήσαμεν.<sup>4</sup> It appears, also, in a similar form in Origen, in his second book against Celsus, c. 46, and in other places. Clement found the passage Matt. 10: 26, in his copy thus: οὐδὲν κρυπτόν ὃ οὐ φανερωθήσεται, οὐδὲ κεκαλυμμένον, ὃ οὐκ ἀποκαλυφθήσεται;<sup>5</sup> as also Origen has quoted it, towards the close of his 16th Homily on Jeremiah. So different were the copies of this period, that the Codex D, prolific in corruptions as it is, gives us but a very imperfect idea of the κοινή ἐκδοσις as it existed even in any one region.

On the margin of the Philoxenian version, there are occasionally found fragments of a manuscript which Thomas of Charkel saw in the monastery of St. Antonius at Alexandria, and from which he inserted particular readings upon the margin of this version; but he did this in the Gospels too rarely to permit us to learn much in regard to them. That the MS. was remarkably rich in such variations, we perceive from the fact that he found in it the grossest and most striking which has yet been discovered, viz. Matt. 20: 28, ὑμεῖς δὲ ζητεῖτε ἐκ μικροῦ ἀυξήσαι, κ. τ. λ. Besides this remarkable passage, in which his Alexandrian MS. agrees with D, he has communicated to us still others. He and D have in common the addition in Mark 4: 9, καὶ ὁ συνιών συνιένω; they also resemble each other in the reading, Luke 12: 1, πολλῶν δὲ μυριάδων συναχθεῖσῶν κύκλῳ, and πολλῶν δὲ ὄχλων συνεπεριχόντων κύκλῳ. The Philoxenian margin has too, in Luke 11: 53, where D inserts the words, ἐνώπιον παντὸς τοῦ λαοῦ after πρὸς αὐτοὺς, the same interpolation; it has even received a fresh addition here. They both also read in John 21: 18, ἄλλοι σε ζώσουσιν and Luke 6: 5, μόνοις τοῖς ἱερεῦσιν, &c. &c. Besides such readings, Thomas also sometimes noted in his margin such as are wholly peculiar, which may be regarded as evidence of the condition of the κοινή ἐκδοσις in other MSS. After Matt. 27: 16, λεγόμενον Βαραββάν, his margin proceeds: ὅστις διὰ σιάνιν τινὰ γενομένην ἐν τῇ πόλει καὶ φόνον ἦν βεβλημένος εἰς φυλακὴν. Luke 22: 23, αὐτῶν τὴν πονηρίαν, τὴν ὑποκρίσιν αὐτῶν. Luke 22: 18,

<sup>1</sup> L. 2. Adv. Haer. c. 21. n. 2.

<sup>2</sup> Dial. cum Tryph. c. 96.

<sup>3</sup> L. 1. Adv. Haer. c. 20. n. 2.

<sup>4</sup> Apol. Maj. c. 16. Dial. cum Tryph. c. 76.

<sup>5</sup> L. Strom. 275. Lyeb. 223. Venet.

ἕως ὅπου καινὸν πίνω αὐτὸ ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τοῦ θεοῦ. John 3: 6, γεγεννημένον ἐκ τοῦ ὕδατος καὶ τοῦ πνεύματος. . . . John 18: 13, τοῦ ἐνιαυτοῦ ἐκείνου, ἀπέστειλεν οὖν αὐτὸν ὁ Ἄννας δεδεμένον πρὸς Καϊάφαν, τὸν ἀρχιερέα.

So impossible is it to obtain a knowledge of the κοινὴ ἔκδοσις from a single MS., that our investigations in the important relic preserved in the library at Cambridge, rather inform us how much we have to wish for another like it, than satisfy our inquiries. Yet since fortune willed that but a single MS. of this kind should escape the ravages of capricious time, it is well that the lot fell to this in particular, which has only become the more instructive to us from the many accidents to which it has been exposed.

But where, in what country, was its text first formed? In Egypt, or more particularly in Alexandria? Such is my opinion, and it seems to me as correct as any critical position is. The MS. does indeed contain readings of several fathers of the second and third centuries, as we have clearly shown; but generally, in the character of the whole text, in the constant similarity of minute readings, which, it is true, are not very striking, but are on that account of more weight when coincident, it approaches nearest to those copies which Clement of Alexandria made use of in his writings, and those which Origen followed in such of his as preceded his emendation of the text, by which he crowned his claims to the gratitude of the Christian school. We may adduce in confirmation of our position, the MS. from which Thomas of Charbel, in the monastery of the Antonians at Alexandria, transferred readings to the margin of the Philoxenian version. For these reasons, I believe the text of this MS. was originally formed in Alexandria or at least in Egypt, before it entered upon its wanderings, and that it presents us with the κοινὴ ἔκδοσις of that country.

## § 26.

We are in possession of another document of the same age, which no longer indeed speaks to us in Greek, but yet affords us considerable information respecting the condition of the text. We mean the old Syriac version, the Peschito, whose origin belongs, according to the most moderate estimate, to the third century.

In many points, in the peculiarities of trifling readings, it bears a striking resemblance to the Cambridge MS. This has long been agreed among critics; and on this account we may spare ourselves any further proof of the assertion. Yet nearly allied to this MS. as it is, and much as it has of its character, it does not lose on that account its own peculiar features, but pursues its course without restraint, often not agreeing with a single MS.

This resemblance to D. frequently presents us anew with the same appearances which we have already considered; but there is also a multitude of novel and in general wholly peculiar readings. Yet I have observed hardly one which is not comprehended under some one of the species above enumerated. Plainer expressions are substituted for obscure ones, or indefinite passages assisted in their sense by a slight alteration or interpolation. Matt. 21: 34, for example, is rendered plain-

er by τοῦ ἀμπελῶνος αὐτοῦ after τοὺς καρπούς; and Luke 12: 45, by τοῦ κυρίου αὐτοῦ after παιδίσκας. So Luke 9: 34, where for ἐκείνους εἰσελθεῖν, the clause, ὅτε ἔβλεψαν Μωϋσῆν καὶ Ἰλλίαν ἀνελθόντες εἰς τὴν νεφ. . . . was inserted. Passages were transferred from one Gospel into another, as in Matt. 28: 18, after καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς the words: καὶ καθὼς ἀπέσταλκέ με ὁ πατήρ μου, καὶ γὰρ ἀποστέλλω ὑμᾶς, and in Luke 9: 39, after κράζει the words: καὶ τρίζει τοὺς ὀδόντας αὐτοῦ &c. &c. Some additions have also arisen from the Church-lessons, e. g. Luke 15: 11, where in the Syriac church the lesson appointed for the fifth day of the first week in Lent commenced, was thus altered: εἶπε δὲ αὐτοῖς πάλιν ὁ Ἰησοῦς, ἀνθρώπος τις. . . Some passages were omitted also on suspicion that they were glosses or explanatory observations; e. g. Mark 7: 2, κοινᾶς χερσὶ τοῦτ. ἔστιν. In short, the cases which we find here are perfectly similar to those before enumerated, and nowhere is any other species of variation presented to our notice.

On the contrary, the text of the κοινὴ ἔκδοσις in Syria was not exposed to so many accidents, as that of the MS. D. No repugnance to Hebrew phrases and idioms is perceptible in it; for they were not strange to the Syrian, being analogous to those of his own language. Hence in this respect the text was more fortunate. Nor is there any trace in it of the influence of the Apocryphal books, nor, what is rather singular, of the harmonies even, although that of Tatian was extensively read in these countries and very long enjoyed favor and repute.

This fact is to be explained by local circumstances which operated differently upon the text in the two countries. Literature of every kind was always rife in Alexandria; and probably this was the birth-place of many of the Apocryphal books. A multitude of *Librarii*, *Diorthotæ* and Grammarians were always active to the advantage or disadvantage of learning, and each diffused the vapours of his own erudition into the surrounding atmosphere; and this perhaps contributed not a little to the production in that populous city of the cavilling, carping tone, for which it was so celebrated. It is true that Syrians at this period frequently travelled to this city to acquire information and learning; but such persons were but individuals, while everything with which papyrus was concerned, was collected permanently in the country which possessed the monopoly of that article. Where the business of Emendator or Scholiast, or pretension to it, was so common, it could not well be otherwise than that the text should be exposed to much ill treatment which it would not meet with elsewhere.

The MSS. of the κοινὴ ἔκδοσις in Syria contained, notwithstanding, several important readings which we seek in vain in the Egyptian MSS. I shall here exhibit some of them which may be regarded as characteristic, and will enable us too, to recognise and trace to their origin such offshoots as in process of time arose from this text. One is in Matt. 6: 13, which is remarkable for being a variation of a different species from any of the preceding, having sprung from the public forms of prayer. It is the well known addition: ὅτι σου ἔστιν ἡ βασιλεία, καὶ ἡ δύναμις, καὶ ἡ δόξα, εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας. Others are Matt. 20: 22, and 23, μέλλω πίνειν—καὶ τὸ βάπτισμα, ὃ ἐγὼ βαπτίζομαι, βαπτισθῆναι. Mark 6: 11, εἰς μαρτύρ. αὐτοῖς—ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν, ἀνεκτότερον ἔσται Σοδόμοις, ἢ Γομόρροις ἐν ἡμέρᾳ κρίσεως, ἢ τῇ πόλει ἐκείνῃ.



Mark 13: 14, τῆς ἐρεμώσεως—τὸ ῥεθὲν ὑπὸ Δανιὴλ τοῦ προφήτου.  
 Luke 4: 18, ἀπέσταλκέ με—ἰάσασθαι τοὺς συντετριμμένους τὴν καρδίαν.

## § 27.

These are the two principal branches of the κοινὴ ἔκδοσις of which we still have any knowledge. Of these the Syriac did not overstep its original bounds; while, on the other hand, the African extended itself far into the western churches. Alexandria had long supplied the west with Greek copies of all works of learning; and the west obtained from the same source MSS. of the N. T.<sup>1</sup>

When at the close of the second, or in the third century, Latin versions of the N. T. were composed in Italy and on the northern coast of Africa, they were made from the κοινὴ ἔκδοσις. How could it be otherwise when there existed none of the recensions which originated at the close of the third century? The agreement of these versions with D is undeniable and striking, and not another word is necessary to make it probable that they were derived from similar Greek copies.

Simple and historically true as is this solution of their mutual agreement, and obvious as it is, yet some have been more inclined to turn their attention to a distance, and to suppose reasons which are neither well contrived nor natural. The Latins have been accused of altering the Greek text according to their versions. But did they then interpolate the copies of Justin Martyr and Clement of Alexandria according to their versions? Did they have emissaries in Syria to corrupt the Greek text and the copies of the Peschito there? Did they corrupt too the Syriac MSS. of the Nestorians? And did they moreover alter Marcion's Codex according to their views and their version? Was there any Latin version in the time of Irenæus? or if there were, was the Greek text immediately altered according to it? did it become directly the idol of the Latins?

When did the Latins begin to think so highly of their version, and to set it up as the standard of the text? Tertullian was not aware of any thing of this kind, when he said: "It is not in the Greek as it has now become current with the Latins through a cunning or a silly *eversion*," (a play upon words; *eversion* for a wretched version.)<sup>2</sup> As little was Victorinus, when he said respecting Matt. 6: 11, "It is otherwise in the Greek; but the Latins did not comprehend it, or were not able to express it."<sup>3</sup> Hilary of Poitiers<sup>4</sup> speaks unfavorably of it, and goes

<sup>1</sup> Suetonius in Domitiano c. 20. "Quamquam bibliothecas incendio absumptas impensissime reparare curasset, exemplaribus undique petitis, missisque Alexandriam qui describerent emendarentque."

<sup>2</sup> Tertull. de Monogam, c. 11.

<sup>3</sup> Victorin, L. II. Contra Arian. c. 8. L. I. c. 49.

<sup>4</sup> Hilar. Tract. in Ps. 138, n. 43. "Latina translatio, dum virtutem dicti ignorat, magnam intulit obscuritatem, non discernens ambigui sermonis proprietatem, quod enim nobiscum scribitur. . . . cum Græcis hoc modo est. . . Comp. Tract. in Ps. 118, Litt. He. n. 1, and De Trin. L. XI. n. 17. "Secundum latinitatem obscurius hoc dictum videtur (Ephes. 1: 17), quia latinitas pronominibus non utitur, quæ græcitas usu honesto et necessario semper usurpat. Ita enim scribitur: ὁ θεὸς τοῦ κυρίου, κ. τ. λ.

back himself to the Greek phraseology; as also Ambrose sometimes appeals to the text in Greek "*unde transtulerunt Latini.*"<sup>4</sup>

Augustine has expressed himself on this point, particularly in his books *De Doctrina Christiana*, as strongly and plainly as any more modern writer: "Et Latinæ quidem linguæ homines, (says he, L. II. *De Doctr. Christ.* c. XI.) quos nunc instruendos suscepimus, duabus aliis ad scripturarum divinarum cognitionem opus habent, Hebræa scilicet et Græca, ut ad exemplaria *præcedentia* recurratur, si quam dubitationem attulerit Latinorum interpretum varietas." "We frequently cannot comprehend the translators, he proceeds (L. II. *De Doctr. Chr.* c. 14), unless we bring to our aid the language from which they translated; how often do they miss the sense unless they are possessed of peculiar learning? We are, therefore, obliged to examine the original languages; linguarum illarum, ex quibus in Latinam Scriptura pervenit, petenda cognitio est." Soon afterwards, in the same Book, 16th chapter, he says: "libros autem novi Testamenti, si quid in Latinis varietatibus titubat, Græcis cedere oportere *dubium non est.*" Now, if such were the principles of all the noted fathers of the Latin church, by what right can it be assumed that the so called *Codices Latinizantes* are alterations of the text according to the Latin versions.

The opinion of Jerome on this subject is generally known; and even the later fathers, Sedulius, Beda, and Atto of Vercelli, do not differ from their predecessors on this point. But, while these opinions prevailed, the great schism between the Greeks and Latins occurred, and separated the two churches from each other so far, that the latter, even if they had had the disposition, were no longer able to exert any influence over either the rites, the creed, or the MSS. of the churches which belonged to the Greek patriarchate.

I will not however assert that the inhabitants of *Magna Græcia* or of Southern Gaul, or even readers at Rome, who were acquainted with the Greek language, did not anciently subjoin to the Greek MSS. glosses, explanations, and ill-judged emendations. They might do it with as much right as their brethren in Asia, in Peloponnesus, or Alexandria. Yet our observations on the history of the text, exhibit but a single example, (viz. Luke 12: 30, *ἐσπερινὴ κυλακὴ*;) which seems rather to have been of Italian than pure Greek origin. But I do steadfastly deny that in ancient times the Greek copies were purposely, from prejudice and excessive veneration for the Latin Version, corrupted according to it, and the Bibles of other countries and nations interpolated from it. Such an idea could never have been regarded with favor by learned men, except when they forgot their learning; it is an idea which has hitherto been the greatest hindrance to the development of the history of the text.

If the inaccuracies of occidental copyists, as e. g. the readings, *Πέτρος, λεπρώσου, κατεγέλων αὐτόν*, found in D, are alleged by any one as evidence of corruption by the Latins, let it be remembered that in this discussion we have no concern with the unintentional ignorance of copyists.

If the Latins did thus interpolate, why is it that no Greek MSS. previous to the Montfortian Codex in the fourteenth or fifteenth century,

<sup>5</sup> Ambros. *De Spirit. Sanct.* L. II. c. 5. *De fide.* L. II. c. 4.

contain the celebrated passage of the three witnesses, I. John 5: 7, which stands in several Latin Fathers and Bibles? It was, on account of its doctrinal importance, at least worth the trouble of attempting something in its favor. Now if nothing of the kind was done by the ancients in this place, why should it have been done in other places, in which not even the remotest prejudice in behalf of a creed or of certain favorite opinions could operate?

There is an important doctrinal reading of genuine Latin origin in John 3: 6, which occurs in Tertullian thus: "quod de carne natum est, caro est, *quia ex carne natum est*, et id quod de spiritu natum est, spiritus est, *quia Deus spiritus est, et de Deo natus est*."<sup>1</sup> Yet it appears in no Greek Codex before the twelfth century, and even then not in its whole extent.<sup>2</sup> The same Codex has several such readings of Latin origin; yet they were not introduced into this MS. by a Latin, but a Greek, and by no means *malâ fide* in order to corrupt the text. The copyist says himself, at John 7: 29 where he has inserted such an addition, that he borrowed it from Latin MSS; for the marginal note: *εἰς τὸ Ρωμαϊκὸν εὐαγγέλιον τοῦτο εὔρον* is, as Birch assures us, *ab ipsâ primâ manu*.

Something however of the nature alleged, very naturally took place at this period. It had become the most earnest endeavor of the Greeks to end at once the protracted schism, to bury animosities, and to effect a reconciliation with the Latins. They proposed to the Pope every means of reconciliation, for the purpose of arming the entire Western world against the East, which threatened the destruction of the Empire of Constantinople, and of inducing it to enter upon the celebrated crusades which would assist their sinking state. Under these circumstances, attempts of the kind which we observe in *Codex Barberinus* 10, were natural and are easily comprehended. It was at this period that the Latin text obtained an influence over the copies of other nations which criticism must wish had never been acquired. The close connexion which the Armenian princes maintained with the crusades, brought Haitho, king of Armenia, to a knowledge of the Latin language and version, according to which, unfortunately, he altered and as he thought amended the Bible of his own nation.

Now, as it is not only impossible to prove that any thing of this sort took place in high antiquity, but the contrary rather is evinced on indisputable grounds, the agreement of the first Latin versions with D, or with the MS. exhibited on Thomas of Charkel's margin, can be explained only from the fact, that these MSS. present the free text of the *κοινὴ ἔκδοσις*, and the most ancient Latin versions were made from copies of the *κοινὴ ἔκδοσις*. Hence these versions are in truth, with the exception of what Latin authors of glosses may have smuggled into them, monuments of the most ancient text.

### § 28.

The Latins in their MSS. frequently placed the Greek text by the side of their version, not in order to corrupt it, but that easy recourse might be had, when thought necessary, to the original text. The Greek

<sup>1</sup> Tertull. De carne Christi. c. 18. Ambros. De Spirit. Sanct. L. III. c. 11.

<sup>2</sup> Cod. Barber. 10. in Birch Prolegom. in IV. Evangel. p. XXXIII. seq.



text which they used, was that of the *κοινὴ ἔκδοσις*. In other countries, as soon as an amended text was obtained, the old was generally consigned to oblivion, or to some place of deposit in which were preserved the labors of the ancient fathers; but not so among the Latins. They clung tenaciously to this old edition, which was so closely related to their versions; and regarded the recensions, two of which appeared at nearly the same time, as innovations. Gelasius rejected these recensions, and in his decree, the words of which we shall quote hereafter, classed them among the apocryphal writings; and even Jerome, who possessed incomparably more acquaintance with biblical literature, did not think at all more favorably of them, as we shall see hereafter.

Hence, when this father received a commission from Damasus to amend one of these Latin versions, which was afterwards to be prescribed for general use, he, for this purpose, made use only of *such ancient Greek MSS. as did not deviate widely from the common text of the Latins*.<sup>1</sup> The last characteristic would have been sufficient to assure us that they must have been such *Codices* as are called *Latinizing* among us, even had he not used the expression *ancient Greek MSS.* by which he intends to make it clear. But the word *ancient* further informs us, that they were not copies of the text of the recensions, as these came into circulation hardly eighty years before this father.

Since, then, in the days of Jerome the *κοινὴ ἔκδοσις* had no rival in the West, and even towards the close of the fifth century, was confirmed in its exclusive authority by a decree of Pope Gelasius, we need no further explanation how, after its general circulation elsewhere had ceased, it could come to us in a MS. whose age cannot reach so high as the fifth century, or how it could have been preserved by the side of a Latin version, in a MS. of Italian or Southern Gallic origin, such as the Cambridge Codex.

From these observations we may predict what we have to expect in the various Graeco-Latin MSS. now extant. Among these I know of one remarkable Codex of the four Gospels, which has returned for a time to deep obscurity, until it can appear in daylight in a country which has not met with so fearful a lot as our own. I intended to have adorned this history of the text by its aid; but the events of the last few years have destroyed more than one hope of this kind.

### § 29.

There are also some MSS. of more recent date in our critical stock, which accord in a peculiar manner with the Cambridge Codex and with such (e. g. B and L) as resemble it. One of these MSS. is *Wetst. I.* or *Basil. VI. 27*, a copy of the four Gospels of the tenth century; the other parts of the New Testament which are bound with it, are not of the same date. There is, besides, *Wetst. 13*, or *Codex Reg. 2244*, of the Gospels, (also called *Küsteroparisin. 6.*) of the thirteenth century; and *Wetst. 69* in the library at Leicester, of the fourteenth; also Griesbach's 124, and a Vienna MS. *Lambeck. 31.* of the twelfth century, containing the Gospels.

<sup>1</sup> Epist. ad Damas. "Codicum Graecorum . . . collatione, sed veterum, quae non multum a lectionis Latinae consuetudine discreparent."

These MSS. were mostly written at a period in which it was possible for the Latin version to have an influence upon the condition of the Greek text, and, as we have seen, really had. There is therefore a well-grounded suspicion respecting them, that they are *Codices Latinizantes*, and that the resemblance between D and them may have been occasioned by transferring into them from the Latin Bibles, those readings which the latter derived originally from the κοινή ἑκδόσις, from which they were translated.

I. Yet there are in these MSS., viz. 1, 13, 69, 124, very ancient readings which occur no where else. Cod. 13 and 124 read in Matt. 15: 6. *ἡκυρώσατε τὸν νόμον τοῦ θεοῦ*, as Ptolemy in the second century worded the passage in his Letter to Flora, n. 2. He has also given Luke 6: 29, with the peculiar reading, *στρέψον αὐτῷ καὶ τὴν ἄλλην*, (Ep. ad Flor. n. 4.) which is to be found only in 69 and 124. Porphyry charged Matthew with ignorance for ascribing to Isaiah the citation, Matt. 13: 35;<sup>1</sup> while of the MSS. now extant, only 1, 13, 33, 124, and MS. 10, read *διὰ Ἡσαίου τοῦ προφήτου*. Mark 8: 31, the Peschito and Justin Martyr (*Dial. cum Tryph.* c. 76. and 100.) have given *τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ ἀναστῆναι*, as do 1, 13, 69, 124. Luke 6: 36, Justin read: *οἰκτιρμονες ὡς καὶ ὁ πατὴρ ὑμῶν ὁ οὐράνιος* (*Dial. cum Tryph.* c. 96.); just so 13, 69, 124. Luke 19: 26, Marcion read: *καὶ ὁ δοκεῖ ἔχειν ἀρθῆσεται*: so also Codex 69.

II. They have many readings in common with Origen, which are met with in none of the ancient and in few of the more modern MSS. This is true especially of Codex 1, or *Basil. B. VI. 27*, which, besides, on account of its antiquity, having been written in the tenth century during the schism of the Greeks, is not liable to the charge of Latinizing; but it is true also of the others in many cases. Yet it is incumbent on me to prove it in respect to the Basil MS. just named, in order to remove every possible suspicion of its Latinizing. For this purpose I have selected only such readings as it alone of all the MSS. now known contains, or has in common with only one or two MSS. of modern date. The passages here noticed have already been taken from Origen's works, and hence do not now need a particular citation.

In Matt. 6: 25, the words *καὶ τί πίνετε* are omitted in this Codex; as also by Clement of Alexandria and Justin. In Matt. 7: 28, it reads πάντες οἱ ὄχλοι: 8: 8, it omits ὁ παῖς μου: 10: 23, it reads (as also 13, 124) *φεύγετε εἰς τὴν ἔτεραν, καὶ ἐκ ταύτης διώκωσιν ὑμᾶς φεύγετε εἰς τὴν ἄλλην*: 13: 36, *εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν αὐτοῦ*: 13: 52, *ὅστις προσφέρει ἐκ τοῦ θησαυροῦ*: 14: 36, *ἵνα καὶ μόνον*: so also Cod. 13 and 33. In 15: 11, *κοινοῖ τὸν ἀνθρώπον* is wanting; 15: 22, it reads *θεινῶς δαιμονίζεται*: 16: 12, *ἀπὸ τῶν ἄρτων, ἀλλ' ἀπὸ*. . . 16: 19, *ὅσα ἂν δήσης*. . . *δεδεμένα*. . . *καὶ ὅσα ἂν λύσης*. . . *λελυμένα*: 18: 8, *βληθῆναι εἰς τὴν γένναν τοῦ πυρός*: 18: 10, after *ἄγγελοι αὐτῶν*, *ἐν οὐρανοῖς* is wanting; so also Cod. 13.—18: 17, it reads: *ἔστω σοὶ τὸ λοιπόν*: 18: 25, it omits ὁ κύριος αὐτοῦ; 18: 27, for *τὸ δάνειον* it puts *πάσαν τὴν ὀφειλήν*; 19: 29, for *ἡ πατέρα, ἡ μητέρα* it puts *ἡ γονεῖς*: 21: 13, *πεποιήκατε σπήλαιον*: 22: 7, it writes *ἀνείλε* for *ἀπώλεσε*; 22:

<sup>1</sup> "Evangelista vester Mattheus tam imperitus fuit, ut diceret, 'quod scriptum est per Iesaiam prophetam, &c.'" Hieronym. Comment. in Ps. 77.

16, πρόσωπον ἀνθρώπου; 24: 48, κύριός μου ἔρχεσθαι. All these readings, which we have here extracted from the Gospel of Matthew, and most of which this Codex alone contains without agreeing with any other, occur in the works of Origen, nearly all of which were composed before he prepared his Recension of the text. Hence they are certainly ancient, and their origin falls in the time of the κοινὴ ἔκδοσις.

III. We meet with many of the peculiar readings of this MS. in the Peschito: this is however more especially the case with the MSS. 13, 69, 124. Of this we will present proof. In Matt. 14: 7, the MSS. 13 and 124 read ὤμοσεν for ὁμολόγησεν; 14: 24, ἡδὲ σταδίους πολλοὺς ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς ἀπείχειν, 13 and 124.—16: 27, 1 and 124 have κατὰ τὰ ἔργα for κατὰ τὴν προᾶξιν. 21: 26, εἶχον for ἔχουσι. 22: 37. 13, 69, 124 read διανοία σου, καὶ ἐν ὅλῃ τῇ ἰσχύϊ σου.—Mark 8: 29, ὁ Χριστός, ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ ζώντος, 13, 69, 124.—9: 11, πῶς οὖν λέγουσιν. 13, 69, 124.—9: 34, ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ, τίς αὐτῶν μείζων εἶη. 13, 69.—11: 13, ἦλθεν εἰς αὐτήν, εἰ ἄρα. 69, 124.—12: 6, ὕστερον δὲ ἔτι, for ἔτι οὖν. 13, 69, 124.—14: 64, βλασφημίας τοῦ στόματος αὐτοῦ, 13, 69, 124.—14: 67, ἰδοῦσα αὐτὸν for ἰδοῦσα τὸν Πέτρον. 1, 69.—15: 6, καὶ αὐτὴν ἐορτήν εἰώθει ὁ ἡγέμων ἀπολύειν. 13, 69, 124.

IV. We discover many of their peculiarities in Egypt in the Theban or Memphitic version, and in the Alexandrian MS. in the cloister of the Antonians, from which Thomas of Charkel made extracts.

Hence it appears that the MSS. under consideration do not contain a text collected from modern materials, and which has received its present form from the blunders and caprices of later copyists united in one disorderly mass; but that those readings which are peculiar are in part very ancient. And though it is moreover remarkable that their text agrees so nearly with the unusual readings of Codex D, it is rather to be supposed, that this agreement originated in ancient times, than that it was occasioned by the Latin versions at a period when the Latin versions which contain such readings (namely those antecedent to Jerome) were preserved only here and there as rare copies entirely supplanted by the dominant text.

Hence suspicion can attach itself no longer to any passages but those which bear a striking resemblance to the Latin text of Jerome or Alcuin. And were I freely to concede something of this sort in respect to those MSS. which were written at the period of the reconciliation between the Greeks and Latins, i. e. in the twelfth century and afterwards, as was the case with the MSS. 13, 69, and 124, there would yet remain the general conclusion that, such passages excepted, they present a very ancient text, nearly that of Codex D, i. e. the κοινὴ ἔκδοσις.

Now the reason why, long after the κοινὴ ἔκδοσις had gone out of use, transcripts were still made from it, was, I suppose, that the librarii, who knew nothing of an amended text, eagerly copied such MSS. as were recommended by a venerable exterior and the marks of high antiquity.

In conclusion I have further to observe, that Codex 124 harmonises more than its companions with the old Syriac version, and with a Recension which was formed from MSS. of the κοινὴ ἔκδοσις of Syria.



## § 30.

Now as the Cambridge MS. gives us a representation of the *κοινὴ ἔκδοσις* of the Gospels, we may reasonably expect to find the same in the Acts of the Apostles. And certainly its text in this book resembles very much that of the Gospels. It deviates just as much from the usual track of MSS., contains as many notes and glosses of learned and unlearned men, and evinces everywhere that many persons have been concerned in adding to it, and in putting it into a condition which resembles any thing rather than that of a MS. which has been tested by the rules of criticism and purified from every thing extraneous.

There is a most evident resemblance to this MS. in the Codex of William Laud, Archbishop of Canterbury, which once, it is clear, belonged to the Venerable Bede, and is now preserved in the Bodleian Library at Oxford. It contains the Acts of the Apostles, and bears the mark E, among the MSS. of that book.

Of a similar character was one of those MSS. which Thomas of Charkel found at Alexandria, in the beginning of the seventh century, among the antiquities of the Antonian monastery, and collated upon the margin of the Philoxenian version.

To which may be added an ancient Egyptian version, in the Theban dialect; probably the most ancient of that country.

These four monuments present us with the *κοινὴ ἔκδοσις* of Egypt and the West, as respects the Acts of the Apostles.

The character of the text of this period in another country, Syria, is presented as faithfully as it could be by a single document, in the Church-version of the Syrians, the Peschito.

This view of the Acts, is a natural deduction from that which we have just taken of the *κοινὴ ἔκδοσις* of the Gospels. The former stands or falls according to the fate of the latter. Yet we have several other arguments to support our position in regard to the Acts of the Apostles.

The ancient fathers have quoted this book much less frequently than the Gospels. These latter documents of Christianity were much the richest in information and in materials for moral and doctrinal discourses, and also for polemical purposes. For these reasons, Justin and Theophilus of Antioch and even Clement of Alexandria have seldom made use of the Acts of the Apostles. The same holds true also of Origen, a very voluminous writer. Irenaeus, from the order of his subjects and the method pursued by him, was led more frequently than any other of the ancients to this book; but unfortunately we have scarcely the tenth part of this father's haeresiological works in their original language. Time has destroyed the rest, and has left us, instead, only a Latin translation. Yet we can sometimes still discover, from the connexion, what he read in his copy of the Acts of the Apostles. But this agreeable assistance is not afforded us so frequently as we could wish or as we stand in need of it.

If we may judge from the translation, Irenaeus found in his biblical MS. at Acts 2: 24, instead of *τὰς ὁδοὺς τοῦ θανάτου*, the expression *τὰς ὁδοὺς τοῦ ἔθνους*. We cannot, indeed, certainly determine from

the connexion, that the translator found it so in the original ; but a more ancient father, Polycarp, quotes the passage exactly so in his Epistle to the Philippians, and so it stands in D.<sup>1</sup> The father's reading of Acts 4: 31, is yet extant in the Greek, according to which his copy had, after *μετὰ παρόρησίας*, the addition :<sup>2</sup> *παντὶ τῷ θελόντι πιστεύειν*, which is read in the MS. D, and also in E. Codex E has in Acts 8: 36, after *τί κωλύει με βαπτισθῆναι*, the words : *εἶπε δὲ αὐτῷ ὁ Φίλιππος· εἰὰν πιστεύεις ἐξ ὅλης τῆς καρδίας σου σωθήσῃ. Ἀποκριθεὶς δὲ εἶπε· πιστεύω εἰς τὸν Χριστόν, τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ θεοῦ.* Thomas of Charkel found something similar in his ancient Alexandrian copy ; D wants this. Now it appears from a free citation by Irenaeus, the Greek of which is still extant, that this addition certainly existed in his copy of the Acts : *ὡς αὐτὸς εὐνοῦχος*, says he, *πεισθεὶς, καὶ παραντίκα ἀξιών βαπτισθῆναι, ἔλεγε· πιστεύω τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ θεοῦ εἶναι Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν.*<sup>3</sup> In Acts 14: 10, D and another ancient MS. proceed after *τῇ φωνῇ* thus : *σοὶ λέγω ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ ἀνάστηθι. . .* Irenaeus also read this, for he has comprised its purport in a free narrative : " Et iterum Lystris, et Lyciae, cum esset Paulus cum Barnaba, a nativitate claudum in nomine Domini nostri Jesu Christi ambulare fecisset."<sup>4</sup> This father found too, as Semler has already remarked, in Acts 15: 2, the addition contained in D and in the MS. of Thomas of Charkel. At least he read one half of it : *οἱ δὲ ἐλληλυθότες ἀπὸ Ἱερουσαλήμ* (here Thomas ends) *παρηγγέλλαντο αὐτοῖς, τῷ Παύλῳ καὶ τῷ Βαρνάβᾳ, καὶ τισιν ἄλλοις, ἀναβαίνειν.* This remarkable reading, which makes Paul and Barnabas to have been sent for by the Apostles to Jerusalem, is exhibited in part thus in the paraphrastic narrative of Irenaeus : " Quoniam autem his, qui ad Apostolos vocaverunt eum de quaestione, acquievit Paulus, et ascendit ad eos cum Barnaba ad Hierosolimam" &c.<sup>5</sup>

In all the works of Clement, I find only two important quotations from the Acts of the Apostles. One is from c. 10: v. 11, 12, in which D and E, and also two other MSS. agree with him. It is the following ; *καὶ τι σκεῦος τέτταρσιν ἀρχαῖς ἐκδεσμένον ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς πάντα τὰ τετράποδα καὶ τὰ ἐρπετὰ τῆς γῆς, καὶ τὰ πτηνὰ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ἐν αὐτῷ, κ. τ. λ.* We easily see that this has several peculiarities.<sup>6</sup> The other is from Acts 16: 23—28 ; he quotes it in the fourth book of his Stromata, and a part of it again in the fifth.<sup>7</sup> The remarkable readings in it are : *χειρῶν ἀνθρωπίνων*, in which he is accompanied by D and another older MS ; *πᾶν γένος ἀνθρώπων*, in which the MS. of Thomas of Charkel agrees with him ; and lastly *ζητεῖν τὸ θεῖον*, as is read in D and the Latin text of Irenaeus. To these may be added Acts 7: 22, where he had in his copy *πᾶσαν τὴν σοφίαν*, like Codex D.<sup>8</sup>

1 Lib. III. Adv. Haer. c. 12. n. 2. Polycarp. Segm. 2.

2 Lib. III. Adv. H. c. 12. n. 5.

3 Ibid. n. 8.

4 L. III. c. 12. n. 9.

5 L. III. c. 13. n. 3. and Semler Proleg. in Epist. ad Galat. p. 50.

6 Paedagog. L. II. p. 149. Sylb. and 175. Venet.

7 Strom. L. I. c. 19. Stromat. L. v. c. 11. and 12.

8 Strom. L. I. c. 23.

Since large and express quotations from the Acts of the Apostles seldom occur among the ancients, it is the more worthy of observation that these few exhibit so many and so considerable variations, almost exclusively peculiar to D and E and the MS. of the Antonians at Alexandria. The striking uniformity in remarkable readings, which appears in the few remains we have on one side, affords reasonable ground for presuming that a like agreement would be visible, could the whole on both sides be presented to our inspection.

### § 31.

In attempting to compose a short sketch of the history of the text of the Acts of the Apostles from the documents enumerated above, we are led to the following observations.

1. Expressions which were uncommon or obscure, were often exchanged for those which were more current or intelligible. Sometimes a difficult clause was helped by the insertion of a word or some small alteration.

2. Frequently such circumstances as are understood of themselves and had been omitted from the conciseness of the style, were supplied by an interpolation. Thus what D and the MS. of the Antonians have added after *παραγενόμενοι*, in Acts 6: 22, viz. *καὶ ἀνοίξαντες τὴν φυλακὴν*, is naturally to be understood. So as to what the copy from which the Peschito was made added in Acts 14: 2: *ἐπήγειραν—ἵα ἐθνῇ, ἵνα κακώσουσι τοὺς ἀδελφοὺς—καὶ ἐκάκωσαν τὰς . . .* Just so, Acts 22: 26, the clause which in D follows *ὁ ἑκατόνταρχος*, viz. *ὅτι Ῥωμαῖον ἐαυτὸν λέγει*, is contained in the narrative without the addition.

3. Sometimes historical circumstances not contained in the text were supplied. E. g. the Syriac *κοινὴ ἔκδοσις* in Acts 12: 1 distinguishes *Ἡρώδης ὁ βασιλεὺς* from several others of the same name by adding *ὁ ἐπικαλούμενος Ἀγρίππας*. Thus the MS. of the Antonians, Acts 12: 5, notes that Peter was not in the custody of a Roman guard, but *τῆς στείρης τοῦ βασιλέως*. In the same chapter, v. 10, a circumstance is mentioned respecting the prison, which is also preserved by tradition, viz. *καὶ ἐξελθόντες—κατέβησαν τοὺς ἐπὶ βαθμοὺς—προῆλθον ὄρμην . . .* just as the passage occurs in D.

4. We must suppose that legends were very early collected respecting celebrated men of the primitive times of Christianity. On this supposition we can explain the appearance presented by the narratives concerning Cornelius the centurion and Aquila. For the *κοινὴ ἔκδοσις* gives them enlarged by circumstances which were drawn from such accounts and noted upon the margin of the Acts, and afterwards incorporated by *Librarii* with the text. The following example respecting Aquila is taken from D and the MS. of the Antonians at Acts 18: 27, *ἐν δὲ τῇ Ἐφέσῳ ἐπιδημοῦντίς τινες Κορίνθιοι καὶ ἀκούσαντες αὐτοῦ, παρεκάλουν συνελθεῖν σὺν αὐτοῖς εἰς τὴν πατρίδα αὐτῶν, συγκατανεύσαντος δὲ αὐτοῦ, οἱ Ἐφέσιοι ἔγραψαν τοῖς ἐν Κορίνθῳ μαθηταῖς, ὅπως ἀποδέξωνται τὸν ἄνδρα, ὃς ἐπιδημήσας εἰς τὴν Ἀχαΐαν, πολὺ συνεβάλλετο ἐν ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις*. A similar example respecting Cornelius occurs in the same two MSS. Acts 10: 24, and 11: 1.



5. Into this book, as into the Gospels, whenever occasion offered, passages were transferred from other biblical writings of the Old or New Testament; but the opportunity was not so frequent as in the Gospels. In Acts 7: 24, after τὸν Αἰγύπτιον, the words: καὶ ἔκρουεν ἐν τῷ ἄμμῳ are added from Exodus 2: 12. So too in D. There is a similar case in MS. E, Acts 7: 3; Comp. Genesis 12: 1. In D there is an addition to Acts 15: 20, borrowed from Matt. 7: 12: καὶ ὅσα μὴ θέλουσιν ἑαυτοῖς γίνεσθαι, ἑτέροις μὴ ποιεῖτε.

6. Numerous irregularities in this book arose from the church-lessons. We will not unnecessarily multiply proofs of this assertion; two examples only shall suffice. A church-lesson commenced at Acts 3: 1, and also at 5: 1; hence we find in the text of D, at the commencement of the first of these lessons, the trite formula: ἐν δὲ ταῖς ἡμέραις ταύταις; and the second occasioned a similar interpolation in E: ἐν αὐτῷ δὲ τῷ καιρῷ ἀνὴρ τις Ἀνανίας. . . .

Such briefly are the various species of corruptions; but the number of particular instances comprehended under them is incomparably greater in this book than in either of the Evangelists. Many of them, too, are of such extent that the MSS. of the Gospels can show nothing like them, excepting perhaps the well known passage, Matt. 20: 28. Hence the Acts of the Apostles, in reality, suffered in the period of which we are treating more than any other book in all the New Testament.

It was least disfigured in Syria; at all events the Peschito, which is at present the only standard we have by which to judge, does not contain so many or so extensive variations as we find elsewhere. The few dangerous circumstances which it had to encounter in Syria, on which we have before remarked, (§ 26.) afford us a satisfactory explanation of the mild fate of this book in that country.

But the fate experienced by the Acts of the Apostles in Egypt, and particularly the city which was its capital at that period, was different and much more severe. Yet the MSS. which originated there, were not all exposed to the same injuries; there is such a difference in their condition, as we should expect from a period in which every individual heedlessly added glosses to his Codex.

The *Cod. Laud.* or E, contains a purer text of the Acts than D. In the former variations are frequently found which exist in a more enlarged state in D. E. g. after οὐ δυνήσεσθε καταλύσαι αὐτούς, in Acts 5: 39, E adds: οὔτε ὑμεῖς οὔτε οἱ ἀρχοντες ὑμῶν; this addition D extends thus: οὔτε ὑμεῖς, οὔτε οἱ βασιλεῖς, οὔτε τύραννοι, ἀπέχεσθε οὖν ἀπὸ τῶν ἀνθρώπων τούτων, μήποιε. . . . and in Acts 13: 43, after χάριτι τοῦ θεοῦ, E proceeds: ἐγένετο δὲ κατὰ πᾶσαν πόλιν φημισθῆναι τὸν λόγον, D adds something further: ἐγένετο δὲ καθ' ὅλης τῆς πόλεως διελθεῖν τὸν λόγον τοῦ θεοῦ.

Nearly as in other respects the MS., which was found and collated by Thomas of Charkel in the monastery of the Antonians, resembles MS. D, the former is much the most disfigured. Wetstein supposed that the MS. of the Antonians was the same which is now at Cambridge; but that learned man was so strongly impressed by their similarities, that he did not consider how much richer in unusual readings the Alexandrian Codex was than our own.

As the readings of the MS. E often lie at the basis of the MS. D, and are enlarged in the latter, it is not rash to consider the text of E as the oldest, although the copy through which it has reached us is not of so high antiquity. But the text of the latter and of that possessed by the Antonians affords us no marks by which to decide respecting the priority of either; for the greater or less corruption in the text, taken alone, determines nothing as to an earlier or a later age, since this depends upon the possessors it chanced to have, and upon their disposition to add glosses.

### § 32.

Having once entered upon these investigations, we must grant them that further attention which is needful to complete them, however little their dry and grave exterior may recommend them. I have labored to present them as simply as possible, and have invariably confined myself within the limits of absolute necessity, that I might not, by an unseasonable profusion of learning, rather obscure our investigations than elucidate and satisfy them.

We must now inquire whether there have been preserved any MSS. of the Pauline Epistles which exhibit their *κοινή ἔκδοσις*, and if so, which they are? It is natural that we should again consult that writer of the period in question, who from the great extent of his works is peculiarly fitted to clear up a point which can be decided only by the comparison of many citations.

Clement of Alexandria agrees with the MSS. ABC and DEFG, which are nearly related to each other. When both classes agree, which not unfrequently happens, his readings are like both. But though these two classes of MSS. frequently harmonise with each other, they have yet in general a very different character.

For the MSS. ABC contain a revised text, (which fact we shall assume at present, until we can take a more particular view of them,) while on the contrary the lawless character of the others does not evince any critical pruning. We must consequently seek in DEFG for the *κοινή ἔκδοσις* of the Pauline Epistles. If this conclusion be correct, the agreement between these two families of MSS. is immediately accounted for. DEFG are the older stock, and ABC are their offspring. The former are transcripts of the copies which, in the times of a loose text, were in circulation in Alexandria, or more extensively in Egypt and Africa; but the text of the latter was formed after an amendment of it had been set on foot, and it still preserves marks of its origin.

Codex D of the Pauline Epistles, (to give a short notice of these MSS; but we shall speak of them more particularly in the sequel,) is the so called Clermont MS., written stichometrically in uncial letters, with one of the Latin versions prior to Jerome by its side. E is a MS. of the former Abbey of St. Germain at Paris, a copy of the preceding. F has long defied all the inquiries of the learned; it was formerly in the possession of a Benedictine house in Reichenau. It is in Greek and Latin, and contains the Epistle to the Hebrews in the latter language only. G, or the so called Boernerian MS., now in the royal library at Dresden, is its companion.

These have a very great agreement with ABC, but still deviate from them in some striking peculiarities, and are, in general, much more lawless. Whenever the two classes agree with each other, Clement almost always agrees with both. When they separate, he inclines to the side of A, B, and C; but not so constantly that he does not sometimes favor the peculiar readings of D, E, F, and G. We will select some examples, in which DEFG are forsaken by all the ancient MSS. and by nearly all the modern, and notwithstanding are accompanied by Clement.

In the Epistle to the Romans, 3: 26, there is a small peculiarity which occurs only in D and Clement, but gives the passage a totally different turn; they both read τὸν ἐκ πίστεως Ἰησοῦν.<sup>1</sup> In Rom. 5: 12, ἀνθρώπους ὁ θάνατος διήλθεν, Clement reads, ἀνθρώπους διήλθεν<sup>2</sup> like DEFG, without θάνατος. Rom. 10: 21, Clement transposes thus: ἐξεπείασα τὰς χεῖράς μου ὅλην τὴν ἡμέραν in this he is alone; he then says: ἐπὶ λαὸν ἀπειθ'. . . in which DE agree with him.<sup>3</sup> Rom. 14: 17, οὐν ἡμῶν τὸ ἀγαθ'. . . say Clement<sup>4</sup> and DEF. In the Paedagogus, in which he sometimes gives different readings from those in his other writings, following consequently a different copy, in 1 Cor. 9: 5, ἀδελφὴν γυναῖκα περιάγειν, he reads γυναῖκας,<sup>5</sup> as do the Latins, Tertullian, and others, mulieres, uxores: D too contains the reading γυναῖκας. In 1 Cor. 9: 22, ἵνα πάντως τινας, he cites ἵνα πάντας, as DEF and G read;<sup>6</sup> and v. 27, ὑπο πικρῶ<sup>7</sup> as DE. In 1 Cor. 12: 10, he has the singular number διακρίσις,<sup>8</sup> in which he is supported by the MS. G only. In 1 Cor. 13: 12, he reads with DEFG βλέπομεν ἄρτι, and with DE ὡς δὲ ἐσόπτρου.<sup>9</sup> In 1 Cor. 14: 11, he has, like DEFG, λαλῶν ἑμοῖ βάρβ. . .<sup>10</sup> In 2 Cor. 11: 3, like DEG, αὐτοῦ φθαρῇ without οὕτω.<sup>11</sup> In Galat. 3: 19, like DFG, εἰέθη.<sup>12</sup> In Eph. 4: 9, he, or rather Theodotus, omits μέρη, as do DEFG.<sup>13</sup> In Eph. 4: 13, only Clement and G read ἐπιγνώσεως τοῦ θεοῦ.<sup>14</sup> Eph. 4: 19, he cites πάσης πλεονεξίας,<sup>15</sup> agreeing with DEFG; and in v. 23 and 24, where he reads ἀνανεοῦσθε and ἐνδύσασθε,<sup>16</sup> G agrees with him. In Philipp. 3: 14, Clement and G have the words ἄνω κλήσεως ἐν Χριστῷ.<sup>17</sup> In Coloss. 1: 28, he reads διδασκόντες ἐν πάσῃ σοφίᾳ:<sup>18</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Paedagog. L. I. p. 119. Heins. et Sylburg. Paris 1641. or p. 141. Ed. Venet.

<sup>2</sup> L. III. Strom. c. 9.

<sup>3</sup> L. II. Strom. c. 9.

<sup>4</sup> L. II. Paedag. p. 142. Sylb. 165. Venet.

<sup>5</sup> L. II. Paedag. p. 144. Sylb. 169. Venet.

<sup>6</sup> L. V. Strom. c. 3.

<sup>7</sup> L. III. Strom. c. 16.

<sup>8</sup> L. IV. Strom. c. 21.

<sup>9</sup> L. I. Strom. c. 19. L. V. Strom. c. 1. Paedag. L. I. p. 99. Sylb. and 120. Venet.

<sup>10</sup> Strom. L. I. c. 16.

<sup>11</sup> Strom. L. III. c. 11. 14.

<sup>12</sup> Strom. L. I. c. 26.

<sup>13</sup> Theod. de Doctr. Orient. c. 43.

<sup>14</sup> Paed. L. I. p. 88. Sylb. 108. and L. IV. Strom. c. 21. where however Sylburg, as he himself confesses in the note, has followed the *textus receptus*, contrary to the MS. of Clement.

<sup>15</sup> Cohort. p. 54. Sylb. 70. Venet.

<sup>16</sup> Paedag. L. III. p. 224. Sylb. 262. Venet. Strom. L. III. c. 15.

<sup>17</sup> Paed. L. I. p. 107. Sylb. 129. Venet.

<sup>18</sup> Strom. L. I. c. 1. towards the end.



so also DEFG. In Coloss. 1: 26, he seems to have had in his text instead of τοῖς ἁγίοις, the words τοῖς ἀποστόλοις αὐτοῦ, although our present editions give the first. For he immediately draws this conclusion from his quotation: ὥστε ἄλλα μὲν τὰ μυστήρια τὰ ἀποκεκρυμμένα μέχοι τῶν ἀποστόλων, κ. τ. λ. which suits only the reading of the MSS. FG, τοῖς ἀποστόλοις αὐτοῦ.<sup>1</sup> Moreover, in Coloss. 3: 5, he, like FG, omits κακὴν,<sup>2</sup> and in 1 Thess. 5: 21, he reads πάντα δὲ δοκιμάζετε;<sup>3</sup> so also DEFG, &c. &c.

It happens, however, much more frequently that he presents the readings of DEFG when they harmonise with one of the MSS. ABC. Occasionally when Clement forsakes them, Origen supplies his place and by his agreement with these MSS. shows that they resemble very much the oldest Alexandrian text. One of the Egyptian versions too, the Thebaic, in the few remains we have of it, closely resembles these MSS.

Yet, although Clement evidently inclines to these in general, he differs from them remarkably in some places and presents us readings which are found at present no where else. I will quote some examples of citations so long that he could not well have given them from memory: e. g. Galat. 3: 26, which he read as follows: πάντες γὰρ υἱοὶ ἐστε διὰ πίστεως θεοῦ ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ.<sup>4</sup> Eph. 6: 9: εὐ ποιεῖτε τοὺς οἰκέτας ὑμῶν ἀνιόντες τὴν ἀπειλήν.<sup>5</sup> Eph. 5: 25, οἱ ἄνδρες τὰς γυναῖκας τὰς ἑαυτῶν ἀγαπάτωσαν;<sup>6</sup> so also v. 22, where he read with Codex A: ὑποτασσέσθωσαν, he changes the order of the words in Rom. 12: 13: τὴν φιλοξ. . . . διώκ. . . . ταῖς χρ. τῶν ἁγ. κοιν. . . .<sup>7</sup> Also 1 Cor. 1: 21: διὰ κηρύγματος τῆς μωρίας σώσαι.<sup>8</sup> Rom. 15: 4 appears still more remarkable: καὶ τῆς παρακλήσεως τῶν γραφῶν τὴν ἐλπίδα ἔχωμεν τῆς παρακλήσεως;<sup>9</sup> yet perhaps we may reasonably suppose this to have been a quotation from memory. This supposition, however, cannot so easily be made in respect to 1 Thess. 5: 7. οἱ μεθύοντες νυκτὸς μεθύσκονται.<sup>10</sup> To be brief, there are many minor variations which are remarkable; such as in Eph. 2: 3, where he merely left out the word φύσει, and 2 Cor. 6: 16, where for εἶπεν ὁ θεός he read εἶπεν ὁ προφήτης,<sup>11</sup> and many others.

The MSS. DEFG most probably present a text nearly allied to the Alexandrian or Egyptian; but their conformity with it is not sufficient to permit us to consider their text as the same.

Did the removal of these MSS. to the West have an influence upon their text and procure them many glosses and supposed emendations, which otherwise they would not have contained? I have no doubt of

<sup>1</sup> Strom. L. V. c. 10.

<sup>2</sup> Strom. L. III. c. 5.

<sup>3</sup> Paedag. L. III. p. 264. Sylb. 308. Venet.

<sup>4</sup> Paedag. L. I. p. 95. 96. Sylb. 116. Venet.

<sup>5</sup> Paedag. L. III. p. 263. Sylb. 308. Venet.

<sup>6</sup> Paedag. L. III. Loc. cit.

<sup>7</sup> Paedag. L. III. 264. Sylb. 309. Venet.

<sup>8</sup> Strom. L. I. c. 18.

<sup>9</sup> Strom. L. IV. c. 5.

<sup>10</sup> Paedag. L. II. 186. S. 218. Venet.

<sup>11</sup> Cohort. ad gent. 16. S. 23. Ven. Strom. L. III. c. 11.

it. Irenaeus, in the few places in which he yet speaks to us in Greek, or where it can be gathered from the connexion or from his inferences what he found in his copies of the Bible, supports the readings of these MSS: e. g. Rom. 11: 32, where he gives πάντα εἰς ἀπειθείαν,<sup>1</sup> like DEFG; or Rom. 5: 19, where he reads ὑπακοῆς τοῦ ἑνὸς ἀνθρώπου with DEF.<sup>2</sup> So 1 Tim. 1: 4, where he and D have οἰκοδομήν.<sup>3</sup> In 1 Cor. 15: 55, he read: ποῦ σου θάνατε τὸ νῆκος, ποῦ σου θάνατε τὸ κέντρον; for he comments upon the passage, and his exposition applies only to θάνατος;<sup>4</sup> so we find it in DEFG. In Gal. 3: 19, FG read: τί οὖν ὁ νόμος τῶν πράξεων ἐτίθη ἄχρῃς. . . . where the common text has τί οὖν ὁ νόμος; τῶν παραβάσεων χάριν ἐτίθη, ἄχρῃς. . . . In Irenaeus it appears in the Latin as in FG; and when we consider his reasoning upon it, it is evident that he did not have χάριν in his Bible at all, and highly probable that he also read πράξεων instead of παραβάσεων.<sup>5</sup>

We might derive further illustration from Marcion's readings, if indeed he really composed his Apostolikon in the West. The passage 1 Cor. 10: 19, as he read it: ὅτι ἱερόθυτον τί ἐστίν, ἢ εἰδωλόθυτον τί ἐστίν, comes very near the MSS. FG. In 1 Cor. 15: 50, he read κληρονομήσαι οὐ δύνανται simply thus, οὐ κληρονομήσουσι, like FG; and in 2 Cor. 5: 3, καὶ ἐνδυσάμενοι οὐ γυμνοί, like DFG. In Galat. 5: 9, he read τὸ ἄνθος δολοῖ, like DE; and in Galat. 5: 14, he omitted ἐν τῷ before ἀγαπήσεις, as do DFG. All these readings appear in the Latin fathers, as also another of this same heretic for which he was reproached, and which occurs in none of the MSS. now extant. It is in 1 Cor. 14: 19, and is to all appearance only a mistake of the copyist: it is διὰ τοῦ νόμου instead of διὰ τοῦ νοός μου. The Latin versions which the fathers used must therefore have been made from such copies as these; for we cannot rationally reverse the case, and suppose that Marcion interpolated his Apostolikon from the Latin versions. The Latin fathers in whom we find these readings, were not inhabitants of Italy or Gaul alone, but most of them of Africa, which is a point worthy of notice in the history of the text. It is by no means the case that all the readings in DEFG which do not occur in Clement or even Origen are, on that account merely, not of African origin.

Were we inclined to attribute to the west too great a share in producing the condition of these MSS. our error would be speedily rectified by the oldest Syriac version, which contains a considerable number of those peculiarities which are found in no other MSS. than DEFG.

From all this, it seems to me, we may adduce the following conclusion: The MSS. DEFG contain a very ancient text of the period of the κοινὴ ἔκδοσις, nearly allied to the Alexandrian and Egyptian text, which passed westward along the coast of Africa and was introduced among the Latins in Italy and Gaul.

<sup>1</sup> L. I. Advers. Haer. c. 10. n. 3. L. III. c. 20. n. 2.

<sup>2</sup> Fragm. ex caten. in Luc. p. 347. Ven. et Massuet.

<sup>3</sup> Prolog. in L. I. Adv. Haer.

<sup>4</sup> L. III. c. 23. n. 7.

<sup>5</sup> L. III. Adv. Haer. c. 7. n. 2.

## § 33.

Supposing this to be correct, we may now select a few of the traits of the MSS., in order to present a description of the text of Paul's epistles as it existed at the period when it was treated with most license.

We may here at the outset remark with satisfaction that these epistles have not suffered so much as the Gospels and Acts of the Apostles. Didactic writings, which are composed in a straight-forward train of thought and maintain their unity by a close connexion of ideas, do not afford a very free scope for foreign interpolations and glosses; and when these are attempted, they soon betray themselves by the confusion which is created. But historical compositions, which are so simple and often unconnected, and knit together by no internal bond, afford an open field for interpolations both great and small.

The variations of the *κοινή ἑκδόσις* of Syria and of Africa are not so great by far in these epistles as in the historical books; and the remark may here be made anew, that the Syriac text is somewhat purer than that of Western Africa.

I. The species of variations which occur in the Pauline Epistles, are nearly the same as in other books. Hebraisms have been struck out, as, e. g. in Rom. 13: 1, *πᾶσα ψυχὴ ἔξουσ.* . . . *ὑποτασσέσθω*, *בְּכָל* *שָׁמַר*, DEFG have altered thus, *πᾶσαις ἑξουσίαις ὑποτάσσεσθε*. In 2 Thess. 1: 8, *ἐν πυρὶ φλογός* *בְּהֵן שָׂאב*, *ἐν φλογὶ πυρός*. Philipp. 2: 14, *χωρὶς γογγυσμῶν*, G *χωρὶς ὀργῆς*.

II. A more elegant Greek turn was given to harsh phraseology: Philipp. 3: 13, *ἐμαυτὸν οὐ λογίζομαι κατεληγότα*, FG. Galat. 4: 25, *ἐν τῇ Ἀραβίᾳ, ἡ συστοιχοῦσα* . . . *δουλεύει*, DFG. Eph. 2: 11, *διὰ τοῦτο μνημονεύοντες ὑμεῖς οἱ ποτέ*, FG. Coloss. 1: 26, *τὸ μυστήριον τὸ ἀποκεκρυμμένον* . . . *νυνὶ δὲ φανερωθέν*, DE. &c. &c.

III. A more common expression was substituted for one less current: 2 Cor. 12: 13. *ἡτιήθητε ὑπὲρ τὰς* . . . *ἡσσήθητε παρὰ* . . . DE. Rom. 3: 9, *προεχόμεθα*, DG *προκατέχομεν περισσόν*. Rom. 12: 9, *ἀποστιγνοῦντες*, G *μισοῦντες*. Or at any rate this was written on the margin, even if the other was not struck out. Gal. 4: 21, *τὸν νόμον οὐκ ἀκούετε*. In DEFG, some one has written *ἀναγινώσκετε* by the side of *ἀκούετε*. This substitution must be very ancient, for as early as the third century it was united with the original expression in a compound reading, as appears in Origen's second book against Celsus, 3d chapter: *οἱ τὸν νόμον ἀναγινώσκοντες τὸν νόμον οὐκ ἀκούετε*. It is pleasant to see how from one variation arises a second, and from a small one a larger. Such was the case in Coloss. 2: 15, where some person substituted *τὴν σάρκα* for *τὰς ἀρχάς*, as in FG, or (which seems to me most probable) unintentionally, in transcribing, changed *ΤΗΝΣΑΡΚΑ* into *ΤΑΣΑΡΧΑΣ*. The translator of the Peschito found both readings noted in his copy, and united them both in a third: *τὴν σάρκα, τὰς ἀρχάς, καὶ ἑξουσίας*. . .

IV. Frequently words were interpolated for the purpose of throwing light upon a passage which was expressed somewhat obscurely. The passage, 1. Cor. 12: 24, it was thought would become more clear by



the addition of the word *τιμῆς* after *χρεῖαν ἔχει*, as it appears in DEFG and the Peschito. In Philipp. 3: 18, the Peschito inserts the word *ἐτέρως* after *περιπατοῦσι*: in the same Epist. 4: 18, F and G illustrate *τὰ παρ' ἡμῶν* by the addition *πεμαθέντα*, and in Coloss. 4: 9, *πάντα ὑμῖν γνωριοῦσι τὰ ὧδε*, by the addition *πραϊτόμενα*. Thus, too, F and G help Galat. 5: 24, by ὄντες after *Χριστοῦ* and *αὐτῶν* after *σάρκα*.

V. Parallel passages or expressions from other Epistles were written on the margin and afterwards got into the text; in Galat. 4: 17, after *ἵνα αὐτοὺς ζηλοῦτε* we find in the MSS. DEFG, taken from 1 Cor. 12: 31, *ζηλοῦτε δὲ τὰ κρείττονα χαρίσματα*; and in 1 Tim. 6: 9, after *παγίδα* in DFG, the addition *τοῦ διαβόλου* from the same Epist. 3: 7. After *σπέρμα σου*, in Rom. 4: 18, the MSS. FG add *ὡς οἱ ἀστέρες τοῦ οὐρανοῦ, καὶ τὸ ἄμμον τῆς θαλάσσης*, taken from the Old Testament (Gen. 22: 17). Different readings in the Septuagint gave occasion to the alteration which appears in the Peschito in Rom. 9: 25, *καὶ τὴν οὐκ ἡλεημένην, ἡλεημένην*, and in DFG in Cor. 9: 9, *κημώσεις* instead of *φιμώσεις*.

VI. There occurs besides in these Epistles a species of alteration which is peculiar to them, viz. transpositions of words and of construction purposely made in order to render it more easy to comprehend the Apostle's periods, which are often long and interrupted by parentheses. In Rom. 16: 5, the words *καὶ τὴν κατ' οἶκον αὐτῶν ἐκκλησίαν*, which were separated from the main clause by the whole parenthesis from *οἵτινες τοῖς ἐθνῶν*, are transferred in DFG from v. 5 and united to *συνεργ. μου ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ*. In 2 Cor. 12: 21, *πρὸς ὑμᾶς* which, by a very harsh construction, was separated from *ἐλθόντα με* by the words *ταπεινώσει ὁ θεὸς μοι*, is united to it in the MSS. DEFG. In 1 Cor. 14: 34, Paul interrupts his admonitions respecting the abuse of prophetic gifts with the wellknown injunction upon women to be silent in the churches, and does not resume the subject of prophecy (v. 37) till after a very long parenthesis. These rapid transitions violently drag the reader from one circle of ideas to another, and render it difficult for common minds to recover the connexion; on this account the MSS. DEFG remove from their position v. 34, 35, *αἱ γυναῖκες ὑμῶν* as far as *ἐν ἐκκλησίᾳ λαλεῖν* and place them after *κατὰ τάξιν γινέσθω* in v. 40.

In conclusion, no one can be surprised that the text should often have suffered in passing to the Latins through the hands of unsuitable copyists and ignorant emendators. In Eph. 5: 5, *ὅς ἐστιν εἰδωλολάτρης*, some person wished to accommodate the Greek to the Latin termination *Idololatra* and wrote *ὅς ἐστιν εἰδωλολατρεία*, till finally the *ὅς* was changed into *ὅ* as we find it now in FG. Again; in Galat. 2: 7, *πεπίστευμαι τὸ εὐαγγέλιον*, *creditum est mihi evangelium*, *πεπίστευται μοι τὸ εὐαγγέλιον*, FG; and Philipp. 4: 3, *γνήσιε γέρονε σύγγε*, FG.

It is, I think, very difficult to determine which MS. contains the most ancient text, although DE have not been subject to so many alterations as FG. It seems, however, more than probable to me, for many reasons, that a great part of those additions and changes which have been made in Codex D *a secundâ manu*, were taken from G or

F, or rather were derived from some more ancient MS. from which *Librarii* in the West transcribed F and G.

### § 34.

We now come, in order, to the Catholic Epistles; but no MS. of them which preserves the text of the *κοινή έκδοσις* has survived. Some of them are indeed frequently quoted by the ancients. Clement of Alexandria has in different places quoted nearly half of the first Epistle of Peter,<sup>1</sup> and we perceive from his quotations that these Epistles likewise have met with many mischances. E. g. 1 Pet. 3: 1, οἵτινες ἄπειθοι τῷ λόγῳ, and 2, τὴν ἐν λόγῳ ἀγνὴν ἀναστροφὴν. 4: 3, ὁ παρεληλυθὼς χρόνος τὸ βούλημα τῶν ἔθνων κατειργάσθαι. 3: 16, ἵνα ἐν ᾧ καταλαλεῖσθε, καταισχυνθῶσιν οἱ ἐπηρεάζοντες τὴν καλὴν ἀναστροφὴν ὑμῶν ἐν Χριστῷ &c. And Jude, v. 5, ὅτι ὁ θεὸς ἅπαξ ἐκ γῆς Αἰγύπτου λαὸν σώσας, and v. 6, ὑπὸ ζόφον ἀγρίων ἀγγέλων,<sup>2</sup> from which afterwards came ἀγίων ἀγγέλων, and in the ancient Latin versions *sanctorum angelorum*. Yet all these citations do little more than inform us that the fate of these Epistles was about the same as that of the Pauline Epistles, without acquainting us with the particular accidents they have experienced. We may expect more satisfactory information from the Thebaic version, if it shall ever be taken in hand as it deserves to be.

### § 35.

The case is the same with the Apocalypse; no MS. of it has survived to show us its condition in the earliest times. But we derive very satisfactory information respecting it from other quarters. The *κοινή έκδοσις* as we find it in the hands of western fathers of this period, especially those who lived pretty far down in the third century, when it had reached the limit of its circulation among the Greeks, would clearly present the untoward accidents to which the Apocalypse was subjected, had it been exposed to such accidents. But, in looking at this book as cited by Tertullian, and much later by Cyprian, we are sure that it has experienced a very lenient fate, in comparison with that of other books.

Its peculiar obscurity was probably one of the reasons which took away from many the desire to add glosses to it; nor did the severe charges long made against it, and the suspicion of spuriousness founded upon these, contribute less to preserve it from injury. It was on these accounts little read, and to this neglect it is owing that it survived that period in better condition than those books which have been injured by the industry and application of many individuals.

The treatise of Hippolytus on Christ and Antichrist, which there is good reason for supposing genuine, will in a measure illustrate our assertion. In that treatise he has quoted some chapters almost entire, and the variations which occur will therefore give us an idea of the condition of the whole book.

We meet with slight transpositions, small variations in the flexion of

<sup>1</sup> Cohort. ad Gent. p. 40. Sylb. 52. Venet, Pædag. L. I. p. 103. S. 124. V. L. III. p. 244. 249—50. 253. 256—59. S. Strom. L. III. c. 11. c. 18. Strom. L. IV. c. 7. c. 20.

<sup>2</sup> Pædag. L. III. c. 8. p. 239. Sylb. 281. Venet.

words and other deviations of this kind; but we can discover only the following important additions or alterations. In Apoc. 11: 5, *θελήσει ἄδικ . . . and πῦρ ἐξελεύσεται.* In v. 7, he inserts the words: *τὸν δρόμον αὐτῶν καὶ* before *τὴν μαρτυρίαν αὐτῶν.*<sup>1</sup> In Apoc. 12: 16, he reads after *ἐβάλεν* instead of *δράκων* the word *ὕαις*: v. 17, *μετὰ τῶν ἁγίων* instead of *μετὰ τῶν λοιπῶν.*<sup>2</sup> Apoc. 17: 7, he inserts *τοῦ θηρίου* before *τοῦ βασιιάζοντος*; v. 14, *καὶ βασιλεὺς βασιλευόντων ἐστὶ.*<sup>3</sup> Apoc. 18: 2, *ἰσχυρὰ φωνῇ μεγάλῃ*; v. 13, he adds *καὶ τράγους* after *πρόβατα*; v. 19, he uses the expression *πίοιτος* instead of *τιμιότητος*; and v. 20, for *οἱ ἅγιοι* the word *οἱ ἄγγελοι.*<sup>4</sup> The most considerable variation occurs at the commencement of the 12th chapter, which he begins thus: *καὶ εἶδον σημεῖον μέγα καὶ θαυμαστὸν, γυναικῶ περιβεβλημένην τὸν ἥλιον κ. τ. λ.*<sup>5</sup> These are the passages in which the celebrated disciple of Irenæus deviates farthest from the common text and from known MSS. In considering the copiousness of his apocalyptic citations, and the unimportant variations which appear in them, we cannot complain of the boldness and presumption with which the Apocalypse was treated in the period of the *κοινὴ ἔκδοσις*.

## HISTORY OF THE TEXT. SECOND PERIOD.

## § 36.

Such a state of things, however, could not continue long. If some fortunate undertaking had not introduced order into the text, and put a limit to this licentiousness, it would in a few centuries have been involved in unparalleled confusion. This was perceived in time, and the call for a revision was so pressing that three men at the same period and in different countries applied themselves to the task. And certainly the benefit which they conferred upon the Christian world, was of such importance, that they do not merit the oblivion to which their noble labors have been consigned.

Though the name of Origen comes forward into notice in the criticism of the New Testament, yet his reputation in this department of learning was not so solitary and peculiar that he had no rivals. Hesychius and Lucian present themselves with him, emulous of sharing his reputation.

It was these three men who, about the middle of the 3d century, attempted an amendment of the text, and prepared new editions or recensions. They collected the best and oldest MSS. within their reach, in order to learn by this means, what had been recently added, altered,

1 S. Hippolyt. *Demonst. de Christo et Antichristo*, c. 47.

2 S. Hippolyt. *Demonst. de Christo et Antichristo*. c. 60.

3 Ibid. c. 37, 38.

4 Ibid. c. 41, 42.

5 Ibid. c. 60.



or omitted in any of the MSS., and in what text these MSS. uniformly agreed, so that it could be adopted as a standard.

The sphere of Hesychius' labors was Egypt. In this country and its capital his emendation obtained public ecclesiastical sanction.<sup>1</sup> The other circumstances of his life are entirely unknown; but probably he is the same whom Eusebius mentions among the Egyptian bishops who perished in the persecution of Diocletian.<sup>2</sup>

Lucian, surnamed the Martyr, famed for his talents, and particularly for his acquaintance with biblical literature, was a Presbyter of Antioch in Syria. He died at Nicomedia in the persecution of Maximinus, or, as others will have it, under Maximian and Diocletian, and was buried at Helenopolis in Bithynia.<sup>3</sup>

His emendation spread from Syria over Asia Minor, passed the Bosphorus, and became current in Thrace and at Byzantium, subsequently the metropolis of the Roman empire. His reputation extended so far, and his recension was used in so many countries that, from the extensive territory over which it prevailed, it was sometimes improperly termed the *κοινὴ ἑκδοσις*, and *vice versâ* the latter sometimes called by the name of Lucian.<sup>4</sup>

The statements here collected from antiquity relate primarily only to the emendation of the *Old Testament* which Lucian and Hesychius undertook; but since they also did the same with the New, as we learn from the same sources, it is to be inferred that their complete biblical codex met with the same fate and the same reception.

Although these two editions, and that of Origen likewise, were publicly approved in Africa and Asia and in the south-eastern countries of Europe, and although, as Jerome says, the christian world divided itself into three parties and contended respecting them;<sup>5</sup> yet the western christians continued steadfast in their attachment to the ancient text, particularly as it respected the *New Testament*; and if they, or rather Jerome, were somewhat indulgent to Origen's edition, they were on this account the more determined opponents of the Recensions of Lucian and Hesychius,<sup>6</sup> accusing them of incorrect criticism, a

<sup>1</sup> "Alexandria et Egyptus ejus opus amplexi sunt." Hieron. Præf. in Paralip. and Lib. II. Adv. Ruffin. c. 26.

<sup>2</sup> Euseb. Hist. Eccles. L. VII. c. 15. Fabric. Biblioth. Græc. L. IV. c. 13. Hamb.

<sup>3</sup> "Constantinopolis usque ad Antiochiam Luciani Martyris exemplaria probat." Hieronym. Præf. in Paralip. L. II. Adv. Ruffin. c. 26.

<sup>4</sup> "Illud breviter admoneo, ut sciatis aliam esse editionem, quam Origenes et Cæsarensis Eusebius, omnesque Græciæ tractatores *κοινὴν* id est communem appellant, atque vulgatam, et quæ a plerisque nunc Lucianus dicitur." Hieron. Ep. CVI. ad Suniam et Fretell. n. 2.

<sup>5</sup> "Totusque orbis hæc inter se trifariâ varietate compugnat." Adv. Ruffin. L. II. c. 27.

<sup>6</sup> "De NOVO nunc loquor TESTAMENTO. . . . hoc certe, cum in nostro sermone discordat, et in diversos rivulorum tramites ducit, uno de fonte quærendum. Prætermitto eos codices quos a Luciano et Hesychio nuncupatos paucorum hominum asserit perversa contentio, quibus utique nec in toto veteri instrumento pot septuaginta interpretes emendare quid licuit, nec in NOVO profuit emendâsse, cum multarum gentium linguis scriptura ante translata doceat, falsa esse quæ addita sunt." Hieronym. in Epist. ad Damas.

charge which they hoped to support by the versions which existed before the recensions. And certainly, if these and especially the Latin versions were taken as a standard, the decision respecting the amended text could not have been more favorable than it was.

When therefore Pope Gelasius prepared for the first time an *Index librorum prohibitorum*, the editions of Lucian and Hesychius were included in the catalogue with the following harsh language: *The Gospels which Lucian and Hesychius have corrupted are apocryphal.*<sup>1</sup> Thus the western Christians were forever restricted to the *κοινὴ ἔκδοσις*, and no Recension was ever to be allowed currency among them.

But to return: Origen's emendation held sway in Palestine, between the region occupied by Lucian and that of Hesychius.<sup>2</sup> Those who would limit his meritorious labors exclusively to the Old Testament forget that Jerome appeals concerning the Gospels and Epistles to the Origenian MSS.<sup>3</sup>

We shall succeed but ill, however, in attempting to derive information respecting his Recension from his own writings. He himself did not make much use of it; for it was probably the last of his works. His commentaries upon Matthew were composed in extreme old age; and in these, as we have seen above, he complains of the sad condition of the Gospels in the different MSS., and thereupon speaks with complacency of his amendment of the Old Testament. He however does not seem to be aware of any merit of his in regard to the New Testament, although this was precisely the place where he would have spoken of his Recension, if he had already completed it. The old Latin translator of this work, represents Origen as saying, in speaking of his emendation of the Septuagint by means of obelisks and asterisks: *But I did not believe that I could safely undertake anything of this sort with respect to the copies of the New Testament.*<sup>4</sup> It is of little importance to us whether what he here says existed in the Greek or not, since its import is contained in other expressions of Origen as plainly as it is given by the Latin translator.

Hence the inconstancy of Origen's biblical text, which would not have been of this character if it had possessed a fixed and invariable form from a recension; and hence he so often agrees with the *κοινὴ ἔκδοσις* in important variations, and has so many of the various readings of Codex D. If he sometimes presents a text which is evidently purer than that of D., we must remember that Origen had several MSS. at hand, and frequently compared them with each other; a procedure which readily revealed to him many corruptions and rid his quotations of them. From

<sup>1</sup> Decret. Pars. I. Distinct. XV. § 27. "Evangelia quæ falsavit Lucianus apocrypha; evangelia quæ falsavit Hesychius apocrypha."

<sup>2</sup> "Mediæ inter has provinciæ Palæstinos codices legunt, quos ab Origene elaboratos." Hieronym. Adv. Ruffin. L. II. c. 26. The Scholia on Mark XVI. 8. of the MSS. in Birch and Griesbach speak of the *παλαιστινῶν εὐαγγέλιον*. Symb. Crit. Part I. p. 101.

<sup>3</sup> Hieron. Comment. in Matt. XXIV. 36. and in Ep. ad Galat. III. 1.

<sup>4</sup> Origenes Tom. XV. in Matt. Vol. III. De la Rue. p. 671. "In exemplaribus autem Novi Testamenti hoc ipsum me posse facere sine periculo non putavi."

this procedure must have resulted the fact which a distinguished scholar has remarked, that he generally resembles the MS. L.<sup>1</sup> For if we take away from D its most important variations we have a text very similar to that of Codex L.

We can perceive generally, that Origen in his Commentaries upon John, had before him a well preserved Alexandrian text. But after his removal from Alexandria this MS. was no longer at his service. In his subsequent writings we see him following a text sometimes more and sometimes less accurate and similar to D.<sup>2</sup>

Besides these three individuals noted in criticism, the name of Pierius has obtained honorable remembrance on account of his merit in relation to the New Testament. His inclination to biblical studies and his talents procured him the name of the younger Origen.<sup>3</sup> Yet it would rather seem that he materially assisted in Origen's Emendation and in promoting its circulation, than that he undertook a Recension of his own; for Jerome connects the MSS. of Pierius and Origen together in such a manner that one cannot help believing them to have contained one and the same text.<sup>4</sup>

The New Testament of Pamphilus, also, founder of the library at Cæsarea, enjoyed once no mean reputation; he frequently distributed it among Christians that they might become better acquainted with its contents.<sup>5</sup> A copy written by his own hand was long preserved in the library which he founded.<sup>6</sup> In the Old Testament, he was, it is known, merely the editor of Origen, carefully giving the Septuagint from the Hexapla and thus making the work of its industrious author generally useful.<sup>7</sup> Origen's other works, also, he transcribed with his own hand, (an extensive and tedious task,) and evinced himself always a zealous reverer of that scholar's labors.<sup>8</sup> The copies of Pamphilus are therefore, all circumstances considered, only transcripts of Origen's Recension, which were received with especial regard, because coming from the hands of so illustrious a person.

<sup>1</sup> Griesbach Symb. Crit. Tom. I. p. 123—127.

<sup>2</sup> In the opinion of a Reviewer (Tubing. Theol. Quartalschrift, 1822, 2d Heft. p. 281. seq.) it was incumbent on me in a history of the text to investigate Origen's emendation in the works of Eusebius. I employed much time in comparing the citations of this father, until I became at last convinced that, as is often the case with voluminous writers, he quoted from memory and does not agree with himself. My discovery was almost precisely what is admitted by the reviewer himself from his own observation, only one page before he censures me for not collating Eusebius (p. 280.) Eusebius, he says, in the same passages of the Gospels, occurring frequently as many as four times, presents sometimes one and sometimes another reading.

<sup>3</sup> Euseb. Hist. Eccles. L. VII. c. 29. Hieron. de Script. Eccl. v. Pierius.

<sup>4</sup> Hieron. Comm. in Matt. XXIV. 36. "In quibusdam codicibus additum est *neque filius*, cum in Græcis et maxime Adamantii et Pierii codicibus hoc non habeatur adscriptum."

<sup>5</sup> Hieron. De Script. Eccles. and L. II. Adv. Ruffin. c. 9. "Unde et multos codices præparabat, ut, cum necessitas poposcisset, volentibus largiretur." Euseb. H. E. L. VI. c. 32.

<sup>6</sup> Montfaucon, Biblioth. Coislin. p. 262.

<sup>7</sup> Eichhorn Einleit. in das. A. T. Th. I. Cap. III. §. 172. Hieron. L. II. Adv. Ruffin. c. 27.

<sup>8</sup> Euseb. H. E. L. VII. c. 32. Hieron. Script. Eccl. V. Pamphilus.



Or is it rather probable that Origen's emendation, as it was made in the last days of his life, was not edited by himself, but first saw the light through Pierius, and was circulated still more widely by Pamphilus? Or did some person publish it without Origen's critical marks, striking out what he had marked with an obelisk as suspicious, and admitting what he had acknowledged by an asterisk as genuine.

Lastly, in the fourth century a recension of the Old Testament was prepared by Apollinaris, Bishop of Laodicea in Syria; perhaps, however, it was only a translation. Whatever it was, Jerome characterises it as a clumsy production, undertaken with good intentions but with small ability.<sup>1</sup> Were we to extend this criticism to his labors on the New Testament, we should not expect any thing remarkable; yet a Scholion in a Parisian MS., on John 7: 53 to 8: 12, seems to refer to the copies of Apollinaris.<sup>2</sup> It may however be understood as referring to his poetical harmony of the Gospels.

#### THE RECENSION OF HESYCHIUS.

##### § 37.

Some preparation has now been made to enter into the overgrown field of critical documents, to examine them one by one, estimate their value, and arrange them in classes—a vast undertaking, if proposed without limitation. It is no longer even possible to accomplish it entirely. Many have been collated only in particular passages, many only in part, and many not with due care; some probably are not worthy of any pains. Hence we must select only such documents as are best executed and demand peculiar attention from their antiquity and correctness, in order to pronounce decisively as to their character. The rest may follow in the order of time or of merit.

Let us inquire first for the Egyptian recension which, for several reasons, is most easily discovered. As this recension maintained ecclesiastical authority in Alexandria and Egypt, it must be exhibited in the works of the fathers of that country. These, however, follow the text which has come down to us in the MSS. BC and L. B is the celebrated Vatican, N. 1209; C is the MS. N. 9 in the royal library of France, called also that of Ephraem Syrus; L is in the same library, marked N. 62. We shall describe each more fully in its proper place.

The quotations of the celebrated Athanasius, in those works which are ascribed to him by universal consent, in general exhibit this text; as also the writings of the monks Marcus and Marcarius, of Cosmas Indicopleustes, and Cyril archbishop of Alexandria. I have satisfied myself of this by actual collation; but I cannot here present the evi-

<sup>1</sup> Lib. II. Adv. Ruf. c. 33. "Qui bono quidem studio, sed non secundum scientiam de omnibus translationibus in unum vestimentum pannos assuere conatus est."

<sup>2</sup> Τὰ ὀβελισμένα ἐν τισιν ἀντιγραφοῖς οὐ κεῖνται, οὐδὲ Ἀπολλινάριον ἐν τοῖς ἀρχαίοις ὅλα κεῖνται. Richard Simon. Hist. Crit. du texte du Nouv. Test. c. XIII. p. 146.

dence obtained by tedious labor. In respect to the last, however, I must remark that his biblical MS. was disfigured here and there by foreign additions and interpolations.

But, without making use of the evidence to which I have just appealed, this is clearly deducible from the origin of which the text of these MSS. bears infallible marks; for if it be admitted, as I have already shown, that D exhibits most nearly the *κοινή ἑκδοσις* of Alexandria and Egypt, we can be in no doubt respecting the native country of these three MSS. or rather of their text. They are clearly only corrected copies of this *κοινή ἑκδοσις*.

The Coptic version was also made from MSS. of the same country; and it confessedly accompanies the fine monuments which we have been considering as belonging to the Egyptian recension.

Thus they really contain the recension of Hesychius, and by comparing it with the *κοινή ἑκδοσις* from which they were derived we may discover the plan of procedure which the critic pursued. First, we see that he removed the important interpolations which had crept in from harmonies, apocryphal books, or parallel passages in the Old and New Testament, and restored to each of the Evangelists his own property, which was before in many cases confounded with that of others. He besides rejected numerous glosses and Scholia, and expunged clauses introduced from the Lectionaria, and likewise restored some lost ones. These and many like errors which we have remarked in the *κοινή ἑκδοσις* he diligently endeavored to remedy.

Yet he has not been able to destroy a multitude of minute but very evident traces of the copies upon which he labored; there remains still, notwithstanding his amendments, much which does not seem to have merited his forbearance, partly coming from the Lectionaria, and partly from parallel passages. He might too, perhaps, have supplied many omissions which we find in his recension, and have more frequently removed glosses which we now perceive in it. I have only said that this seems to be the case; for, in order to make this charge with more confidence, we should be accurately acquainted in detail with the whole history of the text.

We, however, meet with readings in it which we seek in vain in D; and as he has adopted them, they must have been supported by other MSS. Of this kind is, e. g. in Matt. 27: 49, the addition after *σώσων αὐτόν* in BCL and the Coptic version: *ἄλλος λαβὼν λόγχην, ἔνυξεν αὐτοῦ τὴν πλευρὰν, καὶ ἐξῆλθεν ὕδωρ καὶ αἷμα*; or the transposition in Mark 10: 34, *καὶ ἐμπιύσουσιν αὐτῷ, καὶ μαστιγώσουσιν αὐτόν* or in Luke 6: 48, instead of *ἔθηκε θεμέλιον . . . πέτρων*—the clause: *διὰ τὸ καλῶς οἰκοδομεῖσθαι αὐτήν* as also Mark 10: 49, where instead of *εἶπεν αὐτόν φωνηθῆναι*, there occurs in BCL and the Coptic version: *εἶπεν φωνήσατε αὐτόν*, which two last readings Thomas of Charkel found in his ancient Alexandrian MS.

We must notice particularly a principle of criticism which this man derived from profane literature and unfortunately applied to the New Testament. He made it a rule, it would appear, to prefer a reading which was elegant and pure, as respected Greek idiom, to a difficult Jewish-Greek one, in cases where he found the latter. E. g. Mark 12: 21, for *ἀπέθανεν, καὶ οὐδὲ αὐτὸς ἀφῆκε σπέρμα*, he chose: *ἀπέθανεν*

μὴ καταλιπὼν σπέρμα, which is a more elegant expression. Mark 10: 51, in BCL, τί σοι θέλεις ποιήσω· and John 16: 22, νῦν μὲν λύπην ἔχετε. In Luke 5: 36, the phraseology has received a better turn: ὅτι οὐδεὶς ἐπὶ βλήμα ἀπὸ ἱματίου καινοῦ σχίσας ἐπιβάλλει. . . and Luke 21: 36, is expressed less according to Jewish idiom: ἵνα κατισχύσητε ἐκφυγεῖν· so 23: 42, ὅταν ἔλθῃς εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν σου· so 23: 40, ἐπιτιμῶν αὐτῷ ἔφη, &c. &c.

In the Acts we are deserted by one of these MSS. viz. Codex L, which contains only the Gospels; but its place is supplied by another, viz. A or *Alex. Mus. Britan.*; so that we have ABC to exhibit to us Hesychius' edition of this book. To these may be added a MS. which Euthalius, an Alexandrian deacon, examined and divided stichometrically, or more correctly a transcript of that copy. This MS. is designated by Wetstein and Griesbach as *Acts N. 40*, and is taken from Zacagni's *Monumentis Ineditis*. Codex l, or *Mosc. S. Synod. n. CCCLXXX*, also holds an important rank here: it contains the whole New Testament according to another recension, and in the Acts alone is written according to an Alexandrian copy; as also *Cod. Urbino-Vatican. n. 367* in Birch. It appears to me, that *Cod. Colleg. Nov. Oxon.* in *Mill. Nov. I*, in Wetstein and Griesbach 36, may likewise be classed here.

If we bring in array before us the different kinds of errors which the κοινή ἔκδοσις admitted in this book particularly, and then compare with them the text of these MSS. we can judge what the emendator avoided in this book and what he has done which is of importance. By such a comparison we shall be able to see how, from the corrupt text of MSS. DE and those like them, was deduced the text of the MSS. ABC and their companions, which is more accurate and more free from foreign excrescences.

The MSS. ABC, the Euthalian MS. 40, and Birch's *Urbino-Vat. 367*, present Hesychius' emendation of the Catholic Epistles likewise. But Codex l forsakes us here and passes over to its own recension.

In the Epistles of the Apostle Paul likewise, ABC are the chief monuments of the Hesychian text. With them the Euthalian Codex also agrees, which in the Pauline Epistles is marked in Wetstein and Griesbach N. 46. The *Urbino-Vat. 367* is here unfaithful and fluctuates between two texts; in its stead we add another, viz. *Colbert. 2844*, now N. 14, which was examined *de novo* by Griesbach and after him again collated by Begtrupp, whose extracts Birch has published at the end of his collection of various readings in the Apocalypse. In Wetstein and Griesbach it bears the mark 17.

We shall easily be convinced that the revised text was formed from MSS. which bore a great resemblance to the MSS. DE and FG. This will be evident hereafter, when we extract some specimens from the several recensions and compare them together.

We have the Apocalypse according to the Hesychian Recension in the MSS. AC. Codex B or *Vatican. 1209* does not reach so far; and the MS. which in the Apocalypse bears the mark B does not belong here. But another Vatican MS. with the number 579, collated by Birch, although as is often the case with modern MSS. it contains many heterogeneous readings, plainly ranks with AC. To these *Vindob.*



*Caes*, in *Supplem. Kollarii N. XXVI.* is strikingly similar, though it bears marks of a later date. It has been collated by Professor Alter. To these might be added two other MSS. in the same library, if their character were not rendered doubtful by the numerous chances and changes to which they have been exposed.

Lastly, the Apocalypse which appears at the end of the Euthalian Codex, so often cited, and which is designated by Mill. as *Petav.* 3, by Wetstein and Griesbach *Apoc.* 12, is far from being sufficiently known. But judging from the specimens given by Birch in his collection of various readings in the Apocalypse, and from the other citations of Mill, it exhibits, though not without some recent alterations, the text of the copies AC.

#### LUCIAN'S RECENSION.

##### § 38.

Another recension of the Gospels, (for we must speak first of these,) is contained in the MSS. EFGHSV and *b h*. All these are written in large letters, in the uncial character. The first is a very fine MS. in the library at Basle *Num. B. VI. 21*; the next, F, once belonged to Johann Borcel, the Dutch ambassador at the English court. The MSS. of the Gospels G and H were brought from the East by Erasmus Seidel, and afterwards came into the possession of John Christopher Wolf of Hamburg: the first of them is now in the British Museum, *Harleian.* 5684. The MS. S is in the Vatican Library, n. 354, collated by Birch; V is in the library of the Holy Synod at Moscow; it is a beautiful MS., respecting which Matthæi first gave us correct information. The MSS. *b* and *h*, also, were collated by him; they are two valuable *Evangelitaria*, the first of which is in the same library, n. XLIII.; and the other is in the library of the Holy Synod, n. XII.

If we should here mention the more modern MSS. which are written in cursive characters, the list would be very much augmented. A great part of those which Matthæi collated at Moscow, most of those in Birch and Alter and in Mill and Wetstein, are of this class. A subdivision however might here be made; for it is probable that after this recension had suffered somewhat in the course of time, it was examined and revised by some person. But this incidental remark is an hypothesis, the reasons of which I cannot here unfold without tedious particularity.

The basis of this recension is the *νοινή ἑκδοσις* as it existed in Syria. If this position be correct, as it will soon be found to be, we are no longer in doubt respecting its native country or its author. It must have originated in Syria, and consequently must be the recension of Lucian, Presbyter of Antioch, which extended itself from Syria to Constantinople and Thrace. We recognize it in the Constantinopolitan fathers; e. g. in Theophylact, though we have not his text at present in a state of perfect purity.

We have already selected above some important readings, character-

istic of the most ancient Syrian text, which are not found in Egyptian MSS. before or after Hesychius, nor in the versions of that country. All of these, the number of which we might further increase, we meet with in the large class of MSS., which as we have said present Lucian's Emendation. Matt. 6: 13, *ὅτι σου ἐστὶν ἡ βασιλεία, καὶ ἡ δύναμις, καὶ ἡ δόξα, εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας*, FGSV, *bh*; the MSS. EH. are here defective.—Matt. 20: 22, *μέλλω πίνειν—καὶ τὸ βάπτισμα, ὃ ἐγὼ βαπτίζομαι, βαπτισθῆναι*, and v. 23, *καὶ τὸ βάπτ. ὃ ἐγὼ βαπτ. . . . βαπτισθήσεσθε*, EHSV. Here indeed FG and *bh* are defective, but their testimony could easily be supplied by some dozen others.—Mark 6: 11, *εἰς μαρτ. αὐτοῖς—ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν, ἀνεκτότερον ἐστὶ Σοδόμοις ἢ Γομορροῖς ἐν ἡμέρᾳ κρίσεως, ἢ τῇ πόλει ἐκείνῃ*, EFGHSV, *bh*.—Mark 13: 14, *τῆς ἐρημώσεως—τὸ ῥηθὲν ὑπὸ Δαυιδ τοῦ προφήτου*, EFGHSV, *bh*.—Luke 4: 18, *ἀπέσταλκέ με—ἰάσασθαι τοὺς συντετριμμένους τὴν καρδίαν*—Luke 10: 22, *καὶ σιγραφίς πρὸς τοὺς μαθητάς* εἶπε. John 1: 27, *ὁ ὀπίσω μου ἐρχόμενος—ὃς ἐμπροσθέν μου γέγονεν*. John 5: 16, *οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι—καὶ ἐξήτουν αὐτὸν ἀποκτεῖναι*. John 6: 22, *εἰ μὴ ἐν—ἐκεῖνο εἰς ὃ ἀνέβησαν οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ*. Also John 6: 69, *σύ εἰ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ ζῶντος*. Though here and there in these passages one of the witnesses fails us, as e. g. F, which has not been collated in John, and *bh* which are silent in John 5: 16 and 6: 22, as is the case with *h* also in John 1: 27, we may overlook the circumstance without scruple; for a host of other MSS. of this family would convince us, that these peculiar readings of the *κοινὴ ἔκδοσις* in Syria belong also to this recension.

The origin of this text from the copies of the *κοινὴ ἔκδοσις* as it was read in Syria, can be made clear in no way better than by selecting some suitable passage from the Gospels and comparing it with the Peshito. It cannot but be acceptable to see at one view the two recensions of Lucian and Hesychius, and further to observe the similarity of the latter to Codex D, and to perceive with no trouble how many of its peculiarities are retained in the recension which sprung from it and from MSS. like it. We select for this purpose the fourth chapter of Mark.

## HESYCHIUS.

## LUCIANUS.

1. <i>συνάγεται</i>	BCL.	<i>συνήχθη</i>	
<i>ὄχλος πλείστος</i>	BCL.	<i>ὄχλος πολὺς</i>	
<i>εἰς τὸ πλοῖον ἐμβάντα</i>	BCLD.	{ <i>ἐμβάντα εἰς τὸ πλοῖον.</i>	
<i>γῆς ἦσαν</i>	BCL.	{ <i>Syr.</i>	
6. <i>καὶ ὅτε ἀνέτειλεν ὁ ἥλιος</i>	BCLD. Syr.	<i>γῆς ἦν</i>	Syr.
8. <i>ἄλλα ἔπεσ. . . .</i>	BCL.	<i>ἡλλου δὲ ἀνατείλαντος</i>	
<i>αὐξανόμενον</i>	BCLD.	<i>ἄλλο ἔπεσ. . . .</i>	Syr.
10. <i>καὶ ὅτε</i>	BCLD.	<i>αὐξάνοντα</i>	
<i>ἡρώτων</i>	BCL.	<i>ὅτι δὲ</i>	Syr.
<i>τας παραβολὰς</i>	BCL.	<i>ἡρώτησαν</i>	
11. <i>ὑμῖν τὸ μυστήριον δέδοται</i>	B L. Copt.	<i>τὴν παραβολήν</i>	Syr.
12. <i>ἀφεθῇ αὐτοῖς</i>	BCL.	{ <i>ὑμῖν δέδοται γινῶναι τὸ</i>	
		<i>μυστήριον</i>	Syr.
		{ <i>ἀφεθῇ αὐτοῖς τὰ ἁμαρ-</i>	
		<i>τήματα</i>	Syr.

## HESYCHIUS.

## LUCIANUS.

15. εὐθύς	BCL.	εὐθέως	
ἐν αὐτοῖς (εἰς αὐτούς, B.)	CL.	{ ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις αὐτῶν	Syr.
16. εὐθύς	BCL.	εὐθέως	
18. καὶ ἄλλοι εἰσὶν	BCL.	καὶ οὗτοί εἰσιν	Syr.
ἀκούσαντες	BCLD.	ἀκούοντες	
19. τοῦ αἰῶνος	BCLD.	τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου	Syr.
20. καὶ ἐκεῖνοί εἰσιν	BCL.	καὶ οὗτοί εἰσιν	Syr.
22. ἐὰν μή	BCL.	ὃ ἐὰν μή	
24. ὑμῖν καὶ προστεθήσεται ὑμῖν	BCL.	{ ὑμῖν καὶ προστεθήσεται	
		{ ὑμῖν τοῖς ἀκούουσι	Syr.
28. αὐτομάτῃ ἢ γῇ	BCL.	αὐτομάτῃ γὰρ ἢ γῇ	Syr.
30. πῶς ὁμοίως . . .	BCL.	τίνι ὁμοίως . . .	
31. μικρότερον	B LD.	μικρότερος	
32. μειζων (μείζον) πάντων τῶν } λαχάνων }	BCLD. Syr.	{ πάντων τῶν λαχάνων μει- ζων }	
34. τοῖς ἰδίοις μαθηταῖς	BCL.	τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ	Syr.
36. καὶ ἄλλα	B L. Copt. Syr.	καὶ ἄλλα δέ	
πλοῖα	BC D.	πλοιάρια	
37. ἥδε γεμίζεσθαι τὸ πλοῖον	BCLD.	αὐτὸ ἥδε γεμίζεσθαι	Syr.
38. ἐν τῇ πρύμνῃ . . .	BCLD. Syr.	ἐπὶ τῇ πρύμνῃ . . .	
40. τί δειλοί ἐστε οὕτω	B L. Copt. D. }	{ τί δειλοί ἐστε οὕτω ; πῶς οὐκ.	Syr.

Not to add further examples, we shall find the two recensions to compare throughout in this manner. The variations found in them are only errors of individual MSS. which, if we pay too much attention to them, will often obscure our apprehension of the two recensions. It is to be expected, however, that a considerable number of MSS. should be uniformly alike throughout each recension, and we shall admit in such a case, (which will soon present itself to our notice,) that we have not before us the lawless career of erroneous and accidental readings.

The other point which we wished to evince by the presentation of these specimens, viz. the origin of this recension from the κοινή ἔκδοσις as it circulated in Syria, may have been made evident from our collation of the Peschito, which was composed before Lucian's time and hence from some more ancient copy. Now, in comparing his recension with this old copy, we can readily form an idea of his mode of procedure. We shall perceive that he removed whatever had been transferred from one Evangelist into others, (Matt. 22: 37. 28: 18. Mark 8: 29. Luke 9: 39. 24: 36), whatever had crept in by means of the church-lessons, (Matt. 20: 17. Luke 19: 26), explanatory additions, amplifications and circumlocutions, (Matt. 21: 34. 6: 32. 14: 6. Mark 6: 31. 9: 2. Luke 9: 29. John 7: 39), transpositions, (Matt. 7: 30. Mark 6: 51), and other extraneous matter of the same description.

He, however, admitted readings which did not exist in the copy from which the Peschito was made; e. g. Matt. 25: 13, τὴν ὥραν—ἐν ᾗ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἔρχεται. John 8: 59, ἐκ τοῦ ἱεροῦ—καὶ προήγεν



οὕτως, John 11: 41, τὸν λίθον—οὗ ἦν ὁ τεθνηκὼς κείμενος; which consequently must have been sustained by a majority of his MSS.

This recension, as respects the Acts of the Apostles, appears in the Moscow MSS. *f* or *S. Synod. CCCXXXIII*, *aI* (*S. Synod. XLV*), *b* (*S. Synod. IV. Praxapost.*), *d* (*S. Synod. CCCXXXIV*), also *c* (*S. Synod. CCCLIV*), and *m* (*S. Synod. CCCXXVIII*), which have all been collated by Matthaei; also in Codex *k*, belonging to that scholar. Among these, *f* seems to be the best copy, while *c* and *m* have suffered most by unseasonable corrections. With these agrees another very good MS., *Alexandrino-Vatic. 29* in Birch, as also the MSS. in the royal library, *Lambec. XXXV.* or *Nessel CCXXI.* and *Lambec. XXXVII.* or *Nessel CCCXIII.* All these have a perfectly decided character. They do not, however, stand alone; but their class is very numerous, and MS. belonging to it are found in other collections. Their text however is not exactly pure, or else extracts have frequently been made from them without the requisite accuracy.

In respect to the Acts of the Apostles in this recension, we have particularly to remark that it does not agree so invariably as the other biblical books with the readings of the Syriac text. Yet it does not differ so much that all the traces of its relationship are lost. Among the readings peculiar to this recension there are none of very great extent. The longest is in Acts 26: 30, where the Egyptian Recension says merely, ἀνέστη ὁ βασιλεὺς AB, 40, 367, *l. Copt.*: it is expressed thus in this recension: εἰπόντος αὐτοῦ ἀνέστη ὁ βασιλ. . . . *f, aI, b, d, k, c, m, Alex. Vat. 29, Lambec. XXXV.* and *Lambec. XXXVII.* But the most remarkable is in Acts 20: 28, where some MSS. read κυρίου, others χοιστοῦ and also θεοῦ, and this recension connects the two readings: τὴν ἐκκλησίαν κυρίου καὶ θεοῦ, *f, aI, b, d, k, c, m, Alex. Vat. 29, Lambec. XXXV.* and *Lambec. XXXVII.*

We will here, as in the Gospels, present parallel with each other passages from the two recensions, and we shall select for this purpose Acts 24 and 25. Of the MSS. of the Egyptian Recension which we have before named C is sometimes defective, and of their κοινὴ ἔκδοσις likewise D is defective in both chapters. But we have another celebrated copy of it in the Acts, viz. the Laudian MS. E, which we collate here with the rest.

## ACTS XXIV.

## HESYCHIUS.

- |                           |      |     |      |         |
|---------------------------|------|-----|------|---------|
| 1. μετὰ πρεσβυτέρων τινῶν | AB.  | 40. | 367. | l. E.   |
| 5. σιάσεις                | AB.  | 40. | 367. | l. E.   |
| 9. συνεπέθεντο            | AB.  | 40. | 367. | l. E.   |
| 10. κριτὴν δίκαιον        | B.   | 40. | 367. | l.      |
| εὐθύμως                   | AB.  | 40. | 367. | l.      |
| 11. ἡμέραι δώδεκα         | AB.  | 40. |      | l.      |
| εἰς Ἱερουσαλήμ            | A.   | 40. | 367. | l. Syr. |
| 12. ἐπίστασιν             | AB.  | 40. | 367. | E.      |
| 13. δύνανται σοι          | AB.  | 40. | 367. | l. E.   |
| 15. μέλλ. ἔσεσθαι         | ABC. | 40. |      |         |

## LUCIANUS.

- |                      |      |
|----------------------|------|
| μετὰ τῶν πρεσβυτέρων | Syr. |
| σιάσιν               | Syr. |
| συνέθεντο            |      |
| κριτὴν               | Syr. |
| εὐθυμότερον          |      |
| ἡμέρας δεκαδύο       |      |
| ἐν Ἱερουσαλήμ        |      |
| ἐπισύστασιν          |      |
| δύνανται             | Syr. |
| μέλλ. ἔσεσθαι νεκρῶν | Syr. |

## HESYCHIUS.

## LUCIANUS.

16. ἐν τούτῳ καὶ	ABC. 40. 367. l. E.	ἐν τούτῳ δέ	Syr.
18. ἐν αἷς εὖρ. . .	ABC. 40. 367. l. E.	ἐν οἷς εὖρ. . .	
22. ἀνεβάλετο δὲ αὐτοὺς ὁ Φῆλιξ	ABC. 40. 367. l. E.	ἀκούσας δὲ ταῦτα, ἀνεβάλε- το δὲ αὐτοὺς ὁ Φῆλιξ	Syr.
23. τηρεῖσθαι αὐτόν	ABC. 40. 367. l. E.	τηρεῖσθαι τὸν Παῦλον	Syr.
ὑπηρετεῖν	ABC. 40. 367. l. E. Syr.	ὑπηρετεῖν ἢ προσέρχεσθαι	
25. ἔμφοβος	ABC. 40. 367. l.	ἔσσεσθαι, ἔμφοβος	
26. Παύλου διό	A C. 40. 367. l. E. Syr.	Παύλου, ὅπως λύσῃ αὐτόν διό	
27. χάριτα χάριν	ABC. 40. 367. l.	χάριτας	

## ACTS XXV.

5. ἀνδρὶ ἄτοπον	AB. 40. 367. l. E.	ἀνδρὶ τούτῳ	Syr.
6. οὐ πλείους ὁκτώ ἢ δέκα	ABC. 40. 367. l. Syr.	πλείους ἢ δέκα	
7. περιέστησαν αὐτόν καταφέροντες	AB. 367. αὐτῷ, 40. l. ABC. 40. 367. l. E.	περιέστησαν φέροντες	
κατὰ τοῦ Παύλου omitted.	A C. 40. 367. Syr.	κατὰ τοῦ Παύλου	
8. τοῦ Παύλου ἀπολογου- μένου	ABC. 40. 367. Syr.	ἀπολογουμένου αὐτοῦ	
9. κρινθῆναι	AB. 40. 367. l.	κρίνεσθαι	
11. εἰ μὲν οὖν	ABC. l. E. Syr.	εἰ μὲν γάρ	
15. καταδίκην	ABC. 40. 367. l.	δίκην	
16. ἄνθρωπον πρὶν	ABC. 40. E.	ἄνθρωπον εἰς ἀπώλειαν πρὶν	Syr.
18. ἔφερον, ὧν ὑπεν. ἐγὰρ πονηρὰν οὐ	A C. 40. 367. l. E. ABC. 40. 367. l. E.	ἐπέφερον, ὧν ὑπεν. ἐγώ	
πονηρῶν	Syr.		
20. περὶ τούτων	ABC. 40. 367. l. E. Syr.	περὶ τούτου	
21. ἀναπέμψω	ABC. 40. 367. l. E.	πέμψω	
23. κατ' ἐξοχ. τ. πόλ.	ABC. 40. l. Syr.	κατ' ἐξοχ. οὗσι τῆς πόλ.	
25. καταλαβόμεν αὐτοῦ δέ	AB. 40. 367. l. ABC. 40. 367. l. E.	καταλαβόμενος καὶ αὐτοῦ δέ	Syr.
πέμπειν	ABC. 40. 367.	πέμπειν αὐτόν	
26. τί γράψω	AB. l. Syr.	τί γράψαι	

In the Pauline and Catholic Epistles, the principal MS. of the text of Lucian is a very beautiful one written in uncial characters, (accompanied with Scholia in the cursive character,) which bears the number XCVIII in the library of the Holy Synod and is designated G by Matthæi. As we have already in Paul's Epistles a Codex G we will designate this by the small letter g. After this comes f, then klmcd and the two προξαπόστολοι a3 and b. All except g have been noticed before

in speaking of the Acts; where, however, Codex *l* or *S. Synod* CCCLXXX, was on the side of the Hesychian text.

Besides these Matthæi found a MS. of Paul in particular in the library of the Holy Synod n. XCIX. He cites its readings under the letter *n*.

Moreover, the Epistles of Paul and the Catholic Epistles according to this recension are contained in *Alexandrino Vat.* 29, *Pio-Vat.* 50. collated in Birch, and *Lambec.* XXVIII, *Lambec.* XXXVII, *Lambec.* XXXV, *Lambec.* I or *Nessel.* XXXIII; all in the Royal library at Vienna and collated by Alter. The text of Paul however in these MSS., is preserved in a better and purer state than that of the Catholic Epistles.

The similarity to the *Syriac* version, which appears less striking in the Acts of the Apostles, and in the 25th chapter is scarcely observable, is here exhibited strongly; yet, as is easily conceived, we must except from this remark such of the Catholic Epistles as did not form part of the original contents of the *Peschito*, and were not added till a later period.

The Epistles of Paul contain important peculiar readings, of which we will give one or two examples. In Rom. 8: 1, Lucian's MSS. add after ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ the words: μὴ κατὰ σάρκα περιπατοῦσιν ἀλλὰ κατὰ πνεῦμα, *g. f. k. l. m. n. c. a3. b. Alexandrino Vat.* 29, *Pio-Vat.* 50, *Lambec.* I, XXVIII, XXXV, XXXVII, which is read in very few Alexandrian MSS. Of this addition the *Peschito* has only a part, as far as ἀλλὰ. So, too, the clauses in Rom. 11: 6, εἰ δὲ ἐξ ἔργων, οὐκ ἐτι ἐστὶ χάρις, ἐπεὶ τὸ ἔργον οὐκέτι ἐστὶ ἔργον, which appears in all the MSS. quoted before (together with Codex *d* which did not then agree with the others,) and the old Syriac version, is very seldom found in Hesychian copies. In the 1st Epistle to the *Corinthians*, 6: 20, there occurs after the words σώματι ὑμῶν the clause; καὶ ἐν τῷ πνεύματι ὑμῶν, ἅτινά ἐστι θεοῦ, which is admitted only by Lucian's MSS. (all the MSS. above mentioned,) and the Syriac version. This happens also in the Catholic Epistles, 1 John 5: 13, ταῦτα ἔγραψα ὑμῖν—ταῖς πιστεύουσιν εἰς τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ: in which, contrary to the Alexandrian MSS., all the MSS. coincide, the Syriac version alone dissenting.

That we may again compare the two Recensions with each other and remark the origin of one as to Paul's Epistles from the MSS. DEFG, and of the other from the text exhibited in the *Peschito*, we will select readings from the 9th and 10th chapters of the 1st Epistle to the *Corinthians*, and from Jude, as an example of the Catholic Epistles.

## NINTH CHAPTER.

## HESYCHIUS.

## LUCIANUS.

- |   |                             |  |
|---|-----------------------------|--|
| 1. οὐκ εἰμὶ ἐλεύθερος, οὐκ εἰμὶ ἀπόστολος | AB. Copt. 17. 46. }<br>Syr. | { οὐκ εἰμὶ ἀπόστολος, οὐκ εἰμὶ ἐλεύθερος |
| 7. τὸν καρπὸν αὐτοῦ                       | ABC. 17. 46. DEFG.          | { ἐκ τοῦ αὐτοῦ καρποῦ<br>Syr.            |
| 8. ἢ καὶ ὁ νόμος ταῦτα οὐ λέγει           | ABC. 46. DE. }              | { ἢ οὐχὶ καὶ ὁ νόμος ταῦτα λέγει<br>Syr. |



## HESYCHIUS.

## LUCIANUS.

10. ὀφείλει ἐπ' ἐλπίδι	ABC. 17. 46.	ἐπ' ἐλπίδι ὀφείλει	Syr.
ἐπ' ἐλπίδι τοῦ μετέχειν <sup>1</sup>	ABC. 17. 46. Syr.	{ τῆς ἐλπίδος αὐτοῦ μετέχειν ἐπ' ἐλπίδι	
12. ὑμῶν (τῆς) ἐξουσίας	ABC. 46. DFG.	τῆς ἐξουσίας ὑμῶν	
13. παρεδρεύοντες	ABC. 17. 46. DEFG.	προσεδρεύοντες	
16. καὶ γὰρ μοι	ABC. 17. 46. DEFG.	οὐαὶ δέ μοι	Syr.
18. εὐαγγέλιον, εἰς τό	ABC. 17. 46. D.	{ εὐαγγέλιον τοῦ Χριστοῦ, εἰς τό	
20. ὥς ὑπὸ νόμον, μὴ ὦν αὐτὸς ὑπὸ νόμον	{ ABC. 17. 46. DEFG.	ὥς ὑπὸ νόμον	Syr.
21. Θεοῦ, ἀλλ' ἔννομος Χριστοῦ	{ ABC. 17. 46. DEFG.	Θεῷ ἀλλ' ἔννομος Χριστῷ	
23. πάντα δὲ ποιῶ	ABC. 17. 46. DEFG.	τοῦτο δὲ ποιῶ	Syr.

## TENTH CHAPTER.

1. οὐ θέλω γάρ	ABC. 17. 46. DEFG.	οὐ θέλω δέ	Syr.
2. ἐβαπτίσθησαν	A C. 17. 46. DEFG.	ἐβαπτίσαντο	
9. τινὲς αὐτῶν	ABC. 46. DFG.	καὶ τινες αὐτῶν	Syr.
10. τινὲς	{ ABC. 17. 46. DEFG. Syr.	{ καὶ τινες	
11. τυπικῶς συνέβ. . . .	ABC. 17. 46. F.	τύποι συνέβ. . . .	Syr.
19. . . . εἰδωλόθυτον . . . . .. εἰδωλον . . . .	{ ABC. 17. 46.	{ . . . . εἰδωλον . . . . εἰδωλό- θυτον . . . .	Syr.
20. θύουσι bis.	ABC. 17. 46. DEFG.	θύει bis.	
23. πάντα ἔξεστιν bis.	ABC. 17. 46. DEFG.	πάντα μοι ἔξεστιν bis.	Syr.
24. τὸ τοῦ ἐτέρου	ABC. 17. DEFG.	τὸ τοῦ ἐτέρου ἑκαστος	Syr.
28. τὴν συνειδήσιν Copt.	{ B C. 17. 46. DEFG. Syr.	{ τὴν συνειδήσιν τοῦ γὰρ κυ- ρίου, ἢ γῆ καὶ τὸ πλήρω- μα αὐτῆς	

The contrast between the two Recensions might be presented in many more readings if we could call to our aid a larger number of accurately collated MSS. of the Egyptian text in order, when any of them fail us, to determine from the rest what is the peculiar reading of the Recension. Most probably the following readings are not errors in individual MSS., but belong to the Egyptian text; this is not however, sufficiently well ascertained: 1 Cor. 9: 3, αὕτη ἐστὶ—ἐστὶν αὕτη AB. 46; v. 12, ἐγκοπὴν τινα—τινὰ ἐγκοπὴν AB; v. 15, ἵνα τις κενώσῃ—οὐδεὶς κενώσῃ, AB. 17, and οὐ κέχρημαι οὐδενὶ AB. 17; X. 16, κοιτωνία ἐστὶ (τοῦ) αἵματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ AB; v. 32, καὶ Ἰουδαίοις γίνεσθε AB.

<sup>1</sup> Codex 46 reads ἐπ' ἐλπίδος αὐτοῦ in the second clause.

EPISTLE OF JUDE.

HESYCHIUS.

LUCIANUS.

1. ἡγιασμένοις	AB.	367.	ἡγιασμένοις
3. κοινῆς ἡμῶν σωτηρ . . .	Copt. A.	367.	κοινῆς σωτηρ . . .
4. δεσπότην καὶ κύριον	ABC.	367.	δεσπότην θεὸν καὶ κύριον
5. ἅπαξ πάντα	ABC.	367.	ἅπαξ τοῦτο
15. ἀσεβεῖς	ABC.	367.	ἀσεβεῖς αὐτῶν
18. ἐπ' ἐσχάτου (τοῦ) χρόνου	ABC.	367.	ἐν ἐσχατῷ χρόνῳ
20. ἐποικοδομοῦντες ἑαυτοὺς τῇ ἀγιοτάτῃ ἡμῶν πίσ- τει	AB.	367.	{ τῇ ἀγιοτάτῃ ἡμῶν πιστεῖ ἐπ- οικοδομοῦντες ἑαυτοὺς
22. καὶ οὓς μὲν ἐλέγχετε δια- κρινομένους	ABC. 40. 367.	{	{ καὶ οὓς μὲν ἐλεεῖτε διακρινό- μενοι
23. οὓς δὲ σώζετε ἐκ πυρὸς ἀρπάζοντες (οὓς δὲ ἐλε- ᾶτε) (ἐλεεῖτε) ἐν φόβῳ	ABC. 40. 367.	{	{ οὓς δὲ ἐν φόβῳ σώζετε ἐκ (τοῦ) πυρὸς ἀρπάζοντες
25. μόνῳ θεῷ σωτῆρι ἡμῶν διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ κυρίου ἡ- μῶν	ABC. 40. 367.	{	{ μόνῳ σοφῷ θεῷ σωτῆρι ἡμῶν
δόξα, μεγαλωσύνη ἐξουσία πρὸ παντός (τοῦ) αἰῶνος	AB.	367.	{ δόξα καὶ μεγαλωσύνη ἐξουσία καὶ νῦν καὶ εἰς πάντας τοὺς αἰῶνας

Codex 40, at its commencement, is unfaithful to its Recension, in some minute readings, as I am satisfied from a comparison of the Bæclerian edition from which Zacagni made his extracts; but if we take only the readings in which the Egyptian MSS. cited are all agreed, we shall observe enough variations in so small a compass to show the constant discrepancies between these two recensions.

The Apocalypse of this recension is found in the Moscow MSS. *r k p l* and *o*. Of the first we know neither the situation nor number;<sup>1</sup> we have noticed *k* and *l* before; *p* is *S. Synod.* CCVI; *o* is *S. Synod.* LXVII, with the Scholia of Andreas. These are not all equally valuable, and in general it is very difficult to find among modern MSS. any containing the pure and uncorrupted text of this book; and it is impossible to find so ancient and valuable documents as A and C are in regard to the Apocalyptic text of Hesychius. Codex *o* has suffered most of them all.

A very good MS, however, of this recension is *Harleian* 5613, collated by Griesbach and designated in his edition by the number 29. Also *Lambec.* I, or *Nessel.* XXIII, in *Alter*, and *Alexandrino-Vat.* 68, *Vatican.* 1160, *Pio-Vat.* 50 are among the valuable copies. Andreas, bishop of Cappadocia, followed this text in his commentaries; yet not so exclusively that he did not also make use of other MSS.

MS. B or *Basilianorum in Urbe N.* CV, written in uncial characters

<sup>1</sup> It is noticed very briefly at the end of the Epistle to the Romans in Matthæi's edition, p. 278.

and collated by Wetstein, alternates in its readings between this and the Hesychian Recension. It has also many peculiar readings not met with in either, and appears to me to belong to a peculiar recension, to which Wetstein's N. 9 or *Huntingtonianus* 1, and Wetstein N. 14 or the Leicester MS. may also belong. However, without pursuing this subject further at present, I must content myself with presenting specimens of the two Recensions, of the existence of which we have obtained sufficient proof.

## REV. I.

## HESYCHIUS.

4. ἀπὸ ὁ ὦν
5. λύσαντι  
ἐκ τῶν ἁμαρτ. . . .
9. συγκοινωνός  
καὶ τὴν μαρτυρ. . .  
Ἰησοῦ
13. τῶν λυχνιῶν
15. πεπυρωμένης
18. τῶν αἰώνων

- |                 |      |
|-----------------|------|
| AC.             | 579. |
| AC. Kollar. 26. |      |
| AC. Koll. 26.   | 579. |
| AC. Koll. 26.   | 579. |
| AC. Koll. 26.   | 579. |
| AC.             | 579. |
| AC.             | 579. |
| AC. Koll. 26.   | 579. |

## LUCIANUS.

- ἀπὸ Θεοῦ, ὁ ὦν
- λοιύσαντι
- ἀπὸ τῶν ἁμαρτ. . .
- κοινωνός
- καὶ διὰ τὴν μαρτυρ. . .
- Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ
- τῶν ἐπὶ λυχνιῶν
- πεπυρωμένοι
- τῶν αἰώνων ἀμὴν

## REV. II.

1. τῷ ἐν Ἐφέσῳ
2. τὸν κόπον
3. καὶ οὐ κεκοπίακας
5. ἔρχομαί σοι
9. οἶδά σου τὴν θλίψιν
10. μὴ φοβοῦ  
ἰδοὺ μέλλει
13. οἶδα ποῦ κατοικ. . .  
Ἀντίπας ὁ μάρτ. . .
14. ἐδίδασκεν τ. β.
18. ὀφθαλμούς
20. ἣ λέγουσα

- |                            |      |
|----------------------------|------|
| AC. Koll. <sup>1</sup> 26. |      |
| AC. Koll. 26.              |      |
| AC.                        | 579. |
| AC.                        |      |
| AC.                        |      |
| AC.                        |      |
| AC.                        |      |
| AC.                        |      |
| AC. Koll. 26.              | 579. |
| AC.                        |      |

- τῆς ἐν Ἐφέσῳ
- τὸν κόπον σου
- καὶ οὐκ ἐκοπίασας
- ἔρχομαί σοι ταχύ
- οἶδά σου τὰ ἔργα καὶ τὴν  
θλίψιν
- μηδὲν φοβοῦ
- ἰδοὺ δὲ μέλλει
- οἶδα τὰ ἔργα σου καὶ ποῦ  
κατοικ. . . .
- αἷς Ἀντίπας ὁ μάρτ. . .
- ἐδίδασκεν τ. β.
- ὀφθαλμούς αὐτοῦ
- ἣ λέγει

## REV. III.

2. ἃ ἔμελλον  
ἀποθανεῖν
3. εἰληφας καὶ ἤκουσας καὶ }  
τήρει καὶ μετανόησον }
4. ἀλλ' ἔχεις ὀλίγα ὀνόματα
9. ὅτι ἐγὼ ἠγάπησα
12. ἣ καταβαίνουσα
17. ὅτι πλούσιος  
οὐδὲν χρεῖαν
18. ἐγχρῖς. . . . τοὺς

- |               |      |
|---------------|------|
| AC. Koll. 26. | 579. |
| AC. Koll. 26. | 579. |
| AC. Koll. 26. | 579. |
| AC. Koll. 26. | 579. |
| AC.           | 579. |
| AC.           | 579. |
| AC.           | 579. |
- ἃ ἔμελλες
  - ἀποβάλλειν
  - εἰληφας καὶ μετανόησον
  - ἀλλ' ὀλίγα ἔχεις ὀνόματα
  - ὅτι ἠγάπησα
  - ἣ καταβαίνει
  - πλούσιος
  - οὐδενὸς χρεῖαν
  - ἵνα ἐγχρῖς. . . . τοὺς

<sup>1</sup> Kollar. 26. has here both readings : τῷ τῆς ἐν Ἐφέσῳ.



The number of Constantinopolitan MSS. as may be inferred from what has been said, far exceeds those of the Egyptian text; there is even a great scarcity of the latter. Whence does this arise? Was it not once the case that the West was supplied with Greek MSS. from Egypt? Certainly the state of things has altered very much. At the revival of science in the West, we obtained the Greek literature, MSS., and language by means of comers from Constantinople; and whoever wished to acquire knowledge on these subjects, or to perfect it when acquired, travelled thither or into the isles and provinces of European Greece, and there collected literary treasures from which to draw information on his return. Thus our libraries were supplied chiefly from those countries in which the edition of Lucian was prevalent. Probably a fourth part of our MSS. are from Mt. Athos, and from the hands of the industrious monks who there employed themselves in transcribing.

In Egypt before the fourth century, the knowledge of the Greek language visibly declined; it was then confined to the districts on the coast of the Mediterranean and finally to Alexandria. At the period of the conquest of the Saracens it forsook the country for a while, until it was permitted to return. The influence of the changes that have occurred in Egypt upon the Greek MSS. of the Bible, will be discussed hereafter. (§ 41.)

#### ORIGEN'S RECENSION.

##### § 39.

It was, as we have already said, the last part of a toilsome and indefatigable life that Origen devoted to the emendation of the New Testament. This shows why his labors of this nature are not more often alluded to in his works. He made use of the *vulgaris editio*, as is evident from the frequent singular readings in his citations and the want of uniformity observable in them.

There is a class of MSS. however, which we have reason to ascribe to him. In the more important readings (§ 38), which are found in Lucian's text and not in the Egyptian MSS, e. g. Matt. 6: 13, 20: 22, Mark 6: 11, 13: 14, Luke 4: 18, 10: 22, John 1: 27, 5: 16, 7: 22 and 69, they agree entirely with the Antiochian text, as we here call Lucian's text from the place in which he labored at his task. Such resemblance might be expected on account of the place in which Origen undertook the execution of his emendation; viz. (as it was in his extreme old age) at Tyre, to which place the Antiochian text must have extended its influence if it had any at all. On the other hand, the MSS. we are considering very frequently incline to the Egyptian side in readings of less importance; lastly, they have also many peculiar readings agreeing with neither of the other two recensions.

This family of MSS. consists, as it regards the Gospels, of the following members, A, K, M, 42, 106, 114, 116, and no. 10 in Matthæi.

A or *Codex Alex. Musei Britannici*, though in the Acts, the Pauline and Catholic Epistles and the Apocalypse it exhibits the text of Hesychius, plainly follows another recension in the Gospels, and resembles

the MSS. K or *Cyprius* (formerly *Colbert*. 5149, now in the Royal Library 63) and M in the same Library, formerly 2243<sup>2</sup>, now 48.

MS. 42 in Wetstein was once in the College at Troyes; 106 belonged to the Earl of Winchelsea; 114 is the Harleian MS. 5540 in the British Museum, and 116 the Harl. MS. 5567 in the same, both collated by Griesbach. Codex 10 is a splendid MS. of the Gospels in the Library of Nicephorus, Archbishop of Chersonesus.

We will now present some specimens of this recension.

## LUKE IX.

## Alexandrian Recension.

		Matthaei.		Constantinopolitan Recension.
1. δώδεκα μαθη- ται αὐτοῦ }	δώδεκα	AKM. 42. 106. 114. 116. Mt. 10.		δώδεκα
5. μὴ δέχονται	μὴ δέχονται	AK. 116. Mt. 10.		μὴ δέξονται
10. εἰς πόλιν κα- λουμένην Βη- θσ. . . }	εἰς ἔρημον τόπον πόλεως καλου- μένης Βηθσ. . . }	A. 114. 116. Mt. 10.		{ εἰς τόπον ἔρη- μον πόλεως καλ. Βηθσ. . . }
21. μὴδ. λέγειν τοῦτο	μὴδ. λέγειν τοῦτο	AM. 42. 116. Mt. 10.		μὴδ. εἰπεῖν τοῦτο
22. τ. τ. ἡ. ἐγερ- θῆναι, appar- ently. }	τ. τ. ἡ. ἀναστῆναι	AK. 42. 116. Mt. 10.		τ. τ. ἡ. ἐγερθῆναι
23. ὅπ. μου ἔρχεσθαι ἀρνησάσθω, probably. }	ὅπ. μου ἔρχεσθαι ἀρνησάσθω	AK. 42. 114. 116. Mt. 10. AK. 42. 114. 116. Mt. 10.		ὅπ. μου ἐλθεῖν ἀπαρνησάσθω
αὐτοῦ καὶ ἀκο- λουθ. μοι. ap- parently. }	αὐτοῦ καθ' ἡμέραν καὶ ἀκολουθ. μοι }	AK. 114. 116. Mt. 10.		{ αὐτοῦ καὶ ἀκο- λουθ. μοι }
27. ἀληθῶς, εἰσι ἐσθηκότων	ἀληθῶς ἔτι εἰσὶ ἐστώτων	KM. 116. Mt. 10. AKM. 42. 106. 116. Mt. 10.		ἀληθῶς, εἰσι ἐστώτων
38. ἐπίβλεψον ἐπὶ τόν }	ἐπίβλεψαι ἐπὶ τόν	AKM. 42. 106. 116. Mt. 10.		ἐπίβλεψαί ἐπὶ τόν
41. καὶ ἀνέξομαι	ἕως πότε ἀνέξομαι	K. 42. 116. Mt. 10.		καὶ ἀνέξομαι
45. ἰρωτηῖσαι αὐτόν probably. }	ἐπερωτηῖσαι αὐτόν	KM. 116. Mt. 10.		ἰρωτηῖσαι αὐτόν
50. καθ' ὑμῶν ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν }	καθ' ἡμῶν ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν }	KM. 114. 116. A in part.		{ καθ' ἡμῶν ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν }
55. στραφεῖς δέ	στραφεῖς δὲ ὁ Ἰη- σοῦς }	K. 114. 116. Mt. 10.		στραφεῖς δέ
59. ἀπελθόντι πρῶτον }	ἀπελθεῖν πρῶτον	AK. 42. 114. 116. Mt. 10.		ἀπελθόντι πρῶτον

## LUKE XI.

5. καὶ εἶπε πρὸς	καὶ ἔριε πρὸς	AKM. 42. 106. 114. Mt. 10.		καὶ εἶπε πρὸς
10. κρούοντι ἀνοι- γεται, appar. }	κρούοντι ἀνοιχθή- σεται }	AK. 114.		{ κρούοντι ἀνοι- γῆσεται }
11. δὲ ἐξ ὑμῶν	δὲ ἐξ ὑμῶν	AKM. 42. 106. 114. 116. Mt. 10.		δὲ ὑμῶν
13. πονηροὶ ὑπάρ- χοντες }	πονηροὶ ὄντες	KM. 42. 114. Mt. 10.		{ πονηροὶ ὑπάρ- χοντες }
15. τῷ ἄρχοντι	τῷ ἄρχοντι	AKM. 42. 106. 114. Mt. 10.		ἄρχοντι

Alexandrian Recension.		Constan. Recension.
	15. after δαίμονια } is subjoined : ὁ δὲ ἀποκριθεὶς (or καὶ ἀποκριθεὶς) εἶπε· πῶς δύνα- } ται σατανᾶς σα- } τανᾶν ἐκβάλλειν } ARM. 42. 106. 114. 116. Mt. 10.	
27. σκῆλα	σκεύη	Κ. 42. 114. 116. Mt. 10. σκῆλα
28. φυλάσσοντες	φυλάσσοντες	Α. 42. 114. φυλάσσοντες αὐτόν
44. οὐαὶ ὑμῖν, ὅτι	οὐαὶ ὑμῖν γραμμα- τεῖς καὶ Φαρισαῖ- οι ὑποκριταὶ ὅτι	Α. 114. 116. Mt. 10. { οὐαὶ ὑμῖν γραμμ. καὶ Φαρ. ὑπο- κρι. ὅτι
48. οἰκοδομεῖτε τὰ	οἰκοδομεῖτε αὐτῶν τὰ	AK. 42. 114. 116. Mt. 10. { οἰκοδομεῖτε αὐ- τῶν τὰ
51. ἀπὸ αἵματος } "Αβελ	ἀπὸ τοῦ αἵματος } "Αβελ, τοῦ δι- καίου	KM. 42. 114. Mt. 10. { ἀπὸ τοῦ αἵματος "Αβελ
52. οὐκ εἰσῆλθατε	οὐκ εἰσῆλθατε	A M. Mt. 10. οὐκ εἰσῆλθετε
53. κακείθεν ἐξελ- θόντος αὐτοῦ } ἤρξαντο	λέγοντος δὲ αὐτοῦ } ταῦτα πρὸς αὐ- τοὺς, ἤρξαντο }	{ λέγοντος δὲ α. τ. π. αὐτοῖς ἤρξαντο

The agreement of these MSS. is pretty plain. I am aware however of what may be said on the other hand. I had observed from a collation of other chapters and other Gospels that A and Matthæi 10 are sometimes unfaithful to the family, and that KM and 106 are often silent when they should have a voice, and hence I judged had not been collated word for word, but only hastily. Griesbach collated MSS. 114 and 116 only in certain passages, in order to gain some idea of their character and peculiarities.

All this and more I well knew; but perceiving a striking agreement in these MSS. so far as they were collated, well or ill, I thought a conclusion might be drawn from what was known to what was unknown, from what had been to what had not been collated.

When the revered Griesbach suggested the scruples above mentioned,<sup>1</sup> I felt their force the more because they had before occurred to my own mind. The MS. K was collated anew by one of my pupils and friends, but the result was less satisfactory than I had hoped.<sup>2</sup> Yet from subjecting these MSS. to a new investigation, as minute as possible without another collation, so much was clear, that they maintained a peculiar character of their own, and agreed sometimes with the Alexandrian, sometimes with the Antiochian, or, if it be preferred, the Constantinopolitan text, many times also coinciding with each other in peculiar readings. They may therefore stand separate for the present, until further investigations shall enable the critic to pass a final judgment upon them. Or rather they will always remain separate, since compared with other MSS. they are certainly alone.

<sup>1</sup> Commentar. Crit. in textum Græc. Novi Test. Particula II. da. Accedunt meletemata de vetustis textus recensioibus. Meletem. II. Jenæ. 1811.

<sup>2</sup> See below, Chap. VI, respecting MSS., an account of the *Codex Cyprius*, § 52.

The same character belongs also to the Gospels of the Philoxenian version or text of Polycarp, exclusive of the margin which Thomas of Charkel occupies. In the more important readings pointed out above they agree with Lucian; in the smaller with the Egyptian MSS.; and sometimes they contain readings of their own. As to the agreement of this version with the MSS. AKM &c. it harmonises with this class of MSS. in the passages extracted from Luke. We cannot indeed tell whether the translator read εἰπεῖν or λέγειν, ἀρνήσασθαι or ἀπαρνήσασθαι, ἐστεκότων or ἐσιώτων, and so far the agreement is not so striking as it may be between Greek MSS.; but yet it is perceptible, and this too in remarkable readings. E. g. Luke 9: 22, ἀναστῆναι; 23, καθ' ἡμέραν; 27, ἀληθῶς οἶτι; 41, ἕως πότε; 11: 15, ὁ δὲ ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπε, πῶς δύναται σατανᾶς σατανᾶν ἐκβάλλειν; 22, τὰ σκεύη; 34, σκοτεινὸν ἔσται. K 42, 106. Luke 11: 51, "Ἀβελ τοῦ δικαίου.

That which particularly demands attention in this version, is the critical marks which Origen has elsewhere used, the obelisks and asterisks by which it is distinguished from all the versions of the New Testament, as the Syriac Hexaplar is from those of the Old. Now as the Old Testament version came from Origen's amended text, we are led to believe that it must be the case also with that of the New Testament; especially as both belonged to the same sect, the Monophysites. We may further believe that the translator Polycarp sought an authenticated text that he might employ his time and pains to good purpose, and found in Origen's recension a better than he could have obtained by criticising the text himself. These considerations appeared to justify me in believing, to my satisfaction, that I saw Origen's text in the Philoxenian version, and in referring the origin of the latter to the MSS. which present that text.

A closer relation of these MSS. to the Philoxenian text seemed to me to be pointed out by the fact that their distinctive and peculiar readings are marked with an asterisk in the Philoxenian version. In Mark 10: 20, KM, 42, 114, 116 and Matthæi 10 add, after *ρεότῆτός μου*, the words *τί ἐν ὑστερῶ*, and in Mark 10: 21, after *καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῷ*, the words *εἰ θέλεις τέλειος εἶναι*, both of which appear in the Philoxenian version with the mark \*. So too in Mark 1: 19, where after *δίκτινα* KM and 42 add *αὐτῶν*; Luke 8: 24, where after *γαλήνη* K, 42, 114, 116, Matt. 10, add *μεγάλη*; Luke 9: 23, where after *σταυρὸν αὐτοῦ* AK, 114, 116, Matt. 10, add *καθ' ἡμέραν*; Luke 17: 23, where after *ἐκεῖ* KM, 116, add *ὁ Χριστός* and 42, 114, something similar; Luke 20: 41, where after *πῶς λέγουσι* AKM, 42, have *τινές*; Luke 22: 60, where KM, 42 after *λαλοῦντος*, read *τοῦ Πέτρου* instead of *αὐτοῦ*; Luke 22: 61, where the same MSS. add *σήμερον* after *φωνῆσαι*; and 24: 43, where after *ἔφαγεν*, K, 42, read *καὶ τὰ ἐπίλοιπα ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς*; and John 5: 4, where after *κατὰ καιρὸν* AK, 42 add *ἐλούετο*. All these additions are found marked with an asterisk in the Philoxenian version.

It is true that none of these MSS. yet retain Origen's critical marks, and not a single MS. of the New Testament has them except the Philoxenian version. But it is easily seen how they disappeared from the Greek MSS. The copyists made such confusion in the Old Testament by misplacing the critical signs that it became necessary to drop the obelisks and asterisks and really to strike out or adopt what Origen



had rejected or approved by means of such signs. The *Librarii* did with the New Testament as they had done with the Old ; and the consequence of this was, that the Origenian MSS. were correctly copied without Origen's signs.

So much for the text of the Gospels. It was now my endeavor, under the guidance of the Philoxenian version, to discover those MSS. of the Acts and Epistles likewise, which have preserved the text of this recension. I spared no pains for the purpose, but without success. The Acts and Epistles in the Philoxenian version do indeed maintain a peculiar character, as we shall see further on (§ 76) in treating of this version ; but few MSS. of these parts of the New Testament have been collated, and of these few the greater part not continuously, but in detached passages and without due care. Hence if none are found among them which uniformly resemble the Philoxenian version, the reason seems to be rather the deficiency of collations than real deviation from the MSS. which are allied to this version.

Before we close this period we must defend the preceding narrative of the fate of the text from objections. A strong desire has been manifested to take away the historical grounds upon which we have rested and to adopt another theory upon other pretended grounds.<sup>1</sup>

I. Jerome, to whom we have made frequent appeals, used, as to the Septuagint, the Hexapla text of Origen. But this did not hinder him from admitting that two other recensions existed, viz. those of Lucian and Hesychius, and exercised far more extensive sway than Origen's emendation. He mentions by name the countries in which they maintained ecclesiastical authority. Now when three critics had revised the Old Testament, can it be the case that it never entered the mind of any one to perform the same task for the MSS. of the New Testament likewise, which were more or less disfigured in various countries? And is it at all improbable that the same men examined and corrected the MSS. of the New Testament? If they did so, both Testaments would have been circulated together in those countries which received their emendations. Now the fact is that they did so, as Jerome, though disapproving their labors, testifies in his Epistle to Damasus.

But Jerome only mentions *a mere report respecting the copies of Lucian and Hesychius, which appeared to him wholly uncertain*. Let us not be frightened from investigation by the decided manner in which this is stated. Jerome was commissioned by Damasus to restore one of the existing versions which had become very corrupt, to a pure and stable text. After he had completed his work he gave an account of his mode of procedure in an epistle to Damasus which is brief and rhetorical ; two causes of obscurity which might easily have been avoided in simple narrative details. But he spoke of things which were familiar, and therefore judged it best rather to hint at than to enlarge upon them.

First of all he came to the conclusion that it was in vain to attempt to extricate himself from the chaos of the Latin MSS. without the

---

<sup>1</sup> Dr. John Martin Augustin Scholz. "Biblisch-kritische Reise—nebst eine Geschichte des Textes des Neu. Testament. Leipzig, 1823," and "Curæ criticæ in historiam textus Evangeliorum, Heidelberg 1820."

guidance of the Greek text: "*Si enim Latinis exemplaribus fides est adhibenda, respondeant quibus?*" For this purpose he had indispensable need of not only Greek but good Greek MSS., and not merely one, but many. He labored "*ex codicum Græcorum collatione.*" These must have been selected from a large number; and hence a large number must have been inspected and criticised. An undistinguishing use of MSS., such as some are inclined to suppose him to have made, would have been very indiscreet. He divided them into two classes; the modern or (so called) amended ones of Lucian and Hesychius, upon which his choice ought to have fallen, and the ancient, to which he gave the preference because they harmonized better with the Latin text. "*Codicum Græcorum—sed veterum qui non multum a lectionis Latinæ consuetudine discrepant.*" He reprobated the amended MSS., "*quibus nihil profuit emendâsse;*" for the earlier versions, "*scriptura ante translata,*" contradicted them and the Latin was to be preferred. This was the point: he desired so to amend the Latin text, "*ut a saliva quam quis semel imbibit &c.*" that it should not deviate too widely from the customary Latin text. He incidentally supports the rejection of the emendations of Lucian and Hesychius at Rome (where he then lived) and within its ecclesiastical jurisdiction, by the public opinion, from which only a few perverse men deviated, "*paucorum hominum—perversa contentio.*"

Thus Jerome's task was plain before him. We could have no reason to doubt whether he was really acquainted with the two classes of MSS. unless he had erred in classifying them or had incorrectly stated their relation to the Latin versions. But the relation of the ancient MSS. to the Latin he has confessedly stated aright; and that of the amended ones to the Latin, also, he states to have been what it must have been if the Latin versions were made before the two emendations. Besides, he must have been acquainted with the emendations of Hesychius and Lucian, inasmuch as in his letter to Damasus he ascribes to these men a critical examination not only of the New but also of the Old Testament, of the last of which he treats more at large in other writings. Everything proves that he did not speak in ignorance of his subject.

Now, if my opponent would justify his language, he is bound to prove that Jerome, when he returned to Rome to Damasus, knew nothing certain respecting the copies of Hesychius and Lucian, after he had travelled throughout Thrace and Asia Minor, stayed a long time in Antioch, lived several years at Chalcis in Syria in studious retirement in a monastery, already collected a considerable library, received instruction in Hebrew, consumed a year and some months in his homeward journey to Constantinople, and there sought the company of Gregory Nazianzen with particular reference to the study of the Holy Scriptures. When this is satisfactorily done, he must further show that Jerome while in Rome, neglected to examine the Greek MSS., when it was incumbent on him to inform himself respecting the aid they could afford him in accomplishing his undertaking.

And even then all would not have been done. Jerome moreover appeals to public opinion at Rome, and within its ecclesiastical precincts, from which opinion only a few perverse and contentious men differ.

ed. Thus it was a matter which had been deliberated among people of information. Now the value of the testimony is not altered, though the father followed the decision of the Roman *literati*; for it was the testimony of the perverse as well as the others.

I will mention myself an additional difficulty which does not indeed endanger the main point in controversy, but might have been employed as a subsidiary weapon. Jerome's mouth is full of such language as "*cum multarum gentium linguis scriptura ante translata doceat.*" The Africano-, Italico-, and Gallico-Latin versions might indeed have justified him in using the expression "*cum multarum gentium versionibus,*" but the "*lingua*" was but one. I would not venture the assertion, however, that Jerome, during his stay with the Presbyters and Syrian monks in Chalcis, could not have derived some information respecting their church version and its relation to the Greek text. I could not avouch that the father, in his intercourse with Egyptian bishops and monks who were at that time banished from their country on account of ecclesiastical dissensions, did not yield so far to curiosity, as to converse respecting the versions of Egypt, of which the Upper-Egyptian resembles very much the Latin versions.

II. I must desert my previous opponent for a moment, in order to reply to a learned and estimable man, who proposes a doubt whether metropolitan regulations were then so perfect that the recension of the capital could have been prescribed to a country.<sup>1</sup> But the authority of the metropolis had long before been the standard for the surrounding country, and in later times gave rise to the metropolitan system. The authority of the cities did not proceed from the Patriarchs and Metropolitans, but was exercised by the cities over their own churches with their officers. The capitals contained more learned men and greater resources, and were in general the places of instruction for both Pagan and Christian, (e. g. Alexandria and Antioch,) and from them the country obtained its learned men. Alexandria, it is well known, contained a celebrated school in which Christian teachers qualified themselves for their office. Antioch had one similar which differed from the former as to biblical interpretation. Respecting this school, we have already some elegant investigations,<sup>2</sup> and are promised some more complete from a more learned pen.<sup>3</sup> Now the text of Lucian proceeded from the Antiochian school, and the Hesychian from the Alexandrian, which considered the text as its own. Thus they came from the two principal schools in Christendom. I have not said this for the information of the learned, but only to bring to their recollection what they already knew.

III. I return to my first opponent. He pretends that the ancient corruptions of the text were confined to Alexandria alone. We shall make no reply to certain very weighty arguments presented by him, such as that it would have been indiscreet to permit any such thing, and what

1 Dr. J. Sev. Vater, in the "Kirchen. historischen Archiv. 1823." Halle 2d. Heft. p. 84.

2 "De Schola Antiochena programma." ed. D. Frid. Mønter Selandiæ Episcop. Hafniæ 1811. 4.

3 Neander in his preface to John Chrysostom.



is said respecting the holy character of the bishops, who in other places exercised a better supervision than to suffer it. Alexandria and Egypt were not, to say the least, deficient in holy teachers; but the most holy could not prevent the people, if they read the Bible, from inquiring of learned men respecting an obscure expression and subjoining to the MS. the more intelligible word, or making use of other biblical passages in explanation and noting them on the margin to refresh their memory &c. &c. But enough concerning arguments of this kind. It should not be forgotten that Origen, then and for a long time resident at Tyre, felt the necessity of correcting the MSS. of the New Testament in his vicinity and probably elsewhere, and actually performed the task. The *Codices Adamantii*, whose readings Jerome quotes in his commentaries, leave no room for doubt on this point.

IV. It is somewhat venturesome for any one to assert positively without evidence and to certify under his own hand, that Pamphilus bought up MSS. of the New Testament in Alexandria (which abounded in them) and thus gave occasion for the corruptions which took place in the MSS. of Palestine.<sup>1</sup> Is it probable that he who venerated Origen and his works, especially his critical works, so highly, would have done this? All we know of him would lead us rather to conjecture that he used his utmost endeavours to extend the Origenian MSS.

On the contrary the Alexandrians, out of esteem for the copies of Pamphilus, collated their copies with his in Cæsarea, or caused them to be thus collated. The remains of Codex H in the Epistles are acknowledged to be Alexandrian,<sup>2</sup> and according to the subscription the MS. was collated at Cæsarea with a copy written by Pamphilus' own hand.

V. We are required to do away the difference between the MSS. BC L &c. (which we regard as the later Egyptian text,) and the MSS. of the corrupt text of D *Cantabrigiensis*, together with those which are collated on the margin of the Philoxenian version, and in general all the MSS. which we have wrongly represented as exhibiting the *κοινή ἑξουδοσις*. But if time has made a difference, is it incumbent upon us to do it away? The text of the MSS. of the *κοινή ἑξουδοσις* ceases with the Memphitic version, and is found no later than the writings of the fathers of the 4th century, Athanasius, Macarius, &c., appearing distinctively in no Egyptian father afterwards. Hence the former is the more *modern*, the latter the *antiquated* text. We cannot therefore make use of the sage advice that we should confound together things which time has distinguished.

Other objections are completely obviated by our history of the text and the versions. What we have said of the Armenian version rests on good historical accounts concerning that nation. How then can any one reckon it among the monuments of a pure text, and found inferences upon that supposition?

<sup>1</sup> Dr. J. M. A. Scholz: "Bibl. Krit. Reise und Geschichte des textes. p. 174, 175.

<sup>2</sup> Griesbach *Symbolæ Criticæ*, P. II. P. 83—87.



## HISTORY OF THE TEXT. THIRD PERIOD.

## § 40.

Through the labors of these three learned men, there was now a text established, and a stop put for a time to the destructive proceedings of imprudent men and half-formed critics. This improved state of the text was not indeed of long duration, but it was fraught with important and useful consequences. Ignorant critics could not carry forward the confusion which they had begun; they were obliged to begin anew, and to labor for a long time before they could bring the text back to its former condition.

It was impossible that the recensions should long retain their original purity; for it was not only customary, but even necessary, for the transcribers to consult a second and third copy, in order by their aid to correct the mistakes which had been committed by their predecessors at all events, and from which a transcript could not easily be completely free. For this purpose old copies were generally used when such could be procured, as the subscriptions to the MSS. frequently inform us: ἀντεβλήθη πρὸς τὰ παλαιότατα ἀντίγραφα, πρὸς παλαιὸν ἀντίγραφον &c.

Now it must sometimes have happened that a Codex of the κοινὴ ἔκδοσις was met with, and readings again transferred from it into the revised text. Thus, in Matt. 24: 36, the κοινὴ ἔκδοσις contained after οὐδὲ οἱ ἄγγελοι τῶν οὐρανῶν the addition: οὐδὲ ὁ υἱὸς (D, 13, 124,) which neither Lucian nor Hesychius acknowledged, and which, as Jerome expressly asserts, was not to be found in the third recension, in *Codicibus Adamantii et Pierii*; yet the transcriber of the Vat. MS. B met with it in some old copy and again introduced it. This ancient and valuable MS. has received many other readings from the same source; e. g. Matt. 11: 23, ἕως ἄδου καταβήσῃ, DB; Matt. 12: 48, εἶπε τῷ λέγοντι αὐτῷ, DB; 15: 6, ἠκυρώσατε τὸν λόγον. . . ; 15: 35, καὶ παραγγείλας τῷ ὄλῳ ἀναπεσεῖν ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν ἔλαβε τοὺς ἐπὶ . . . ; 19: 9, τὴν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ παρεκτός πορνείας, 24: 42, πῶς ἡμέρα ὁ κύριος; 25: 39, εἶδομεν ἀσθενοῦντα &c. Such was the case in Codex C in Luke 3: 16, which like D adds εἰς μετάνοιαν after βαπτίζω ὑμᾶς, which Origen in his works expressly rejects as a false reading, and which neither of the recensions has adopted; so Luke 8: 17, ὃ οὐ φανερόν ἐστι, DC; and Luke 8: 42, C reads further after ἀπέθνησκειν—καὶ ἐγένετο ἐν τῷ πορεύεσθαι as it is presented by D, and in part by Marcion; also Luke 11: 43, where C adds, like D, 13, 69 and 124, after ἐν ταῖς ἀγοραῖς—καὶ τὰς προτοκλισίας ἐν τοῖς δειπνοῖς &c. In Luke 18: 36, δύο ἔσονται ἐν τῷ ἄρῳ, ὃ εἰς παραληφθήσεται καὶ ὁ ἕτερος ἀφεθήσεται certainly does not belong to Lucian's recension (it is wanting in FGHSV, b, h and other important MSS. in it); yet it has crept again into d, f, l, and r (Moscow MSS). It was found in some of the copies from which this recension sprung, as we see from the Peschito.

We will not accumulate the examples which are to be found in great numbers in the Gospels, the Acts and the Epistles; but will only observe that this relapse to the old MSS. is frequently chargeable to readers

who noted down readings upon the margin of their MSS. which were afterwards introduced by some one else into the body of the text, or themselves erased the reading of the revised text and wrote another in its stead. Through such an alteration, for example, the word *μόνον* came into the MS. C after *γύλλα* in Mark 11: 13, which is found in the copies of the *κοινή ἔκδοσις*, 13, 69, 124, and in Origen. The case is the same in this MS. with the word *χαίρει* after *λέγει* in Mark 14: 45. So too in C Luke 20: 23, *πανουργίαν* was made *πονηρίαν*, as is read in D and on the margin of the Philoxenian version. So also C obtained, in 1 Cor. 16: 15, after *Στεφανᾶ* the addition *Φορτιουνάτου καὶ Ἀχαικού*, which occurs in FG; and in Col. 1: 12, *τῷ (θεῷ τῷ) ἰκανώσαντι*, which occurs likewise in FG.

People could not cease making glosses now, any more than formerly, as we have abundant evidence in the MSS. I will notice only one example which now lies under my eye. The Euthalian Codex, Acts N. 40 in Wetstein, inserts in Acts 1: 12, between *Ἱερουσαλὴμ* and *σαββάτου ὁδόν* the explanation: *τοσοῦτον ὃν τὸ διάστημα ὅσον δυνατόν Ἰουδαῖον περιπατεῖν*, and likewise Acts 11: 13, N explains *γλένκους* in the margin thus: *τὸ ἀπόσταγμα τῆς σταφυλῆς πρὶν ἀντληθῆναι*, which could not but receive the same honor at the hands of so unskilful a copyist as he must have been who interpolated the former gloss into the text.

Selected passages of the New Testament were now too, as before, read in the churches, and were furnished when necessary with a form of introduction or conclusion which the reader probably wrote only upon the margin. We observe a conclusion of this kind in the margin of the Basle MS. E, and the Seidel MS. H *πολλοὶ γὰρ εἰσι κλητοὶ, ὀλίγοι δὲ ἐκλεκτοί*, Luke 14: 24. In the Moscow MS. V, these words are appended to the text by a later hand; in others they were originally incorporated with it. Now Matthæi has proved from other circumstances that here began a church-lesson. The case is similar with respect to the addition: *ταῦτα λέγων ἐφώνει· ὁ ἔχων ὦτα ἀκοῖν ἀκουέτω* after *πλουτῶν* Luke 12: 21, which is to be seen in the margin of E and V, and in the text of other MSS. Compare the same addition in Luke 21: 4, in several MSS. of Lucian's recension.

Among the rest, too, the conjectures and explanations of the fathers afforded materials for interpolation. We will only refer to two familiar examples. Codex C has in its margin, Matt. 8: 28, the reading *Ἰεργεσηνων*, Codex L has it in the text; in John 1: 28, several MSS. have in the margin and others in the text, originally or by correction, the reading *Βηθαδαρά* instead of *Βηθαρία*. The first was proposed by Origen; the other is recommended by John Chrysostom.

But far more mischievous was the procedure of those who collated their MSS. with a foreign recension, and undertook accordingly what they thought emendations in them, thus mingling the text of two recensions. This has occurred in particular passages very frequently and in very many MSS.; but it is also sometimes the case that this mixture runs through whole chapters and even whole MSS. Had this procedure been more general, such confusion must have been created by this time that it would be wholly impossible to discover and distinguish the several recensions.

The first who pursued such a course throughout the whole text was the Alexandrian deacon, Euthalius, who, under the first consulate of the Emperor Leo, A. D. 462, as he himself states, undertook a peculiar task in regard to the New Testament, of which we shall soon speak more at large. On this occasion he collated the Alexandrian text with the autograph copy of Pamphilus at Caesarea, (as he boasts in the subscription at the end of the Pauline Epistles,) and thus furnished others with the means of interpolating the recension of his own church with Origenian readings.<sup>1</sup>

He himself did not introduce them into the text; he was content to note them on the lower margin. I discovered this from the very old and venerable fragments of an Euthalian Codex, which were once in the possession of Coislin, Bishop of Metz, and which are to be found in Wetstein and Griesbach among the MSS. of Paul's Epistles under the mark H. In the first of these fragments, 1 Cor. 10: 23—9, where the Egyptian MSS. reject the addition, v. 28: τοῦ κυρίου ἡ γῆ καὶ τὸ πλήρωμα αὐτῆς, Euthalius has restored it again from the copy of Pamphilus, by placing an asterisk after συνεῖδουσιν, referring to the margin below in which the clause is presented marked likewise with an asterisk.<sup>2</sup> With intelligent copyists this was productive of no ill consequences; but such were not the greater number. In a later transcript of an Euthalian MS. in the *Cod. Alexandrino-Vatican*: n. 179. (Wetstein Ep. 46.) the readings of which are given by Zacagni, this addition has not crept into the text; but all transcribers were not so prudent. It could not but happen, therefore, that in some MSS. the text of Origen should become mixed with the Egyptian.

Others less discreet than Euthalius placed various readings in the margin without any mark, which were therefore easily taken for emendations, and inserted in the text in subsequent copies. This is the case with the Moscow MS. which Matthaei denominated *a1*. In it are found on the margin of the Acts readings from the Moscow Codex *l*, as we are told by Matthaei: "probabiliores lectiones fere omnes . . . Codicis *l* in margine notatas habet."<sup>3</sup> Codex *l*, however, (if this really be the same as the one before mentioned,) follows in the Acts, as we have already seen, the edition of Hesychius.

One of the successive possessors of the Vienna MS., *Cod. Theol. Graec. Num. CCCII. Lambecii XXXIV.* took a yet bolder course. This MS. contains the Acts, Paul's and the Catholic Epistles, together with the Apocalypse, according to the Constantinopolitan Recension. Now some individual has filled it throughout, as far as the Apocalypse, which he has spared, with foreign readings inserted between the lines and also in the margin. Sometimes he erased the original reading and substituted a new one in its stead; or, when he could not well erase what was to be omitted, placed marks of omission above it.

In examining these corrections we find that they agree with the

<sup>1</sup> Montfaucon Biblioth. Coisliniana, olim Segueriana, p. 262. ἀντεβιβλίῳ δὲ ἡ βιβλος πρὸς τὸ ἐν Καισαρείᾳ ἀντίγραφον τῆς βιβλιοθήκης τοῦ ἁγίου Παμφίλου χειρὶ γεγραμμένον.

<sup>2</sup> Montfaucon Biblioth. Coisliniana, p. 254.

<sup>3</sup> Praefat. in Act. Apost. p. XII, XIII.



MSS. ABC and the Coptic version, or at least with one or other of these documents, so that the greater part of the readings thus introduced are Egyptian, and the whole has become a mixture of different texts.

In this MS. the traces of alterations are still fresh and plainly perceptible; but not so in the Vatican MS. N. 367, which has a peculiar character in the Acts and Catholic Epistles and, as is well known, adheres pretty closely to the Hesychian text. In Paul's Epistles, however, it hesitates and wavers. Yet the text of Paul is not so much disfigured that it cannot be seen that the ground-work is Constantinopolitan. If we examine the deviations we shall soon perceive that they are not entirely irregular, but are all of the same character, viz. Egyptian.

Something of this kind occurs more or less in many MSS.; and among them are some even of the oldest monuments. We have observed before respecting the celebrated Codex A (*Alex. Mus. Britan.*) that, in the *Gospels*, it deviates oftener from its recension than its fellows, and then generally agrees with the Egyptian MSS. In the Acts, Epistles, and Apocalypse it is decidedly Egyptian. What accident put the copyist in possession of an Origenian MS. of the Gospels we cannot tell; but it is easy to perceive that in this part of the text also he made use of an Egyptian MS.

Confusion in the text of the Apocalypse sprung particularly from the Commentaries of Andreas and Aretas. Both were Bishops of Caesarea in Cappadocia. The latter lived in the tenth century; and the age of the former is unknown, opinions varying in respect to it between the fifth and eighth century. Their commentaries were not adapted to the readings of every MS., and yet they were read in many countries. Hence the text was often altered according to the expositions of the commentators. Frequently too their Scholia were blended with the text itself, as we see in many MSS. Now as the Apocalypse, besides the usual accidents which befel all MSS., had to encounter these two in addition, we need be less surprised that modern copies seldom contain a homogeneous text.

## CHAPTER V.

### HISTORY OF THE LESS IMPORTANT ALTERATIONS WHICH HAVE TAKEN PLACE IN THE BOOKS OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.

#### § 41.

After having attempted to collect and exhibit the main points in the history of the text, we may now devote some attention to other appearances in the MSS. which do not concern the text itself, in order to learn their nature, their origin, and antiquity, in what respects they can be of service to us, and how far they may assist us in determining the age of MSS.; points which are not matters of indifference to criticism.



As we commenced our investigations into the history of the text by going back to the writing material employed, so the present inquiries must begin.

This material was anciently the Egyptian papyrus. How long this continued in general use, is not known; but it is certain that the New Testament was written on the skins of animals as early as the fourth century. Constantine the Great had not less than fifty copies made at once, ἐν διαθήκαις, on the skins of animals, for the churches, whose number was daily increasing.<sup>1</sup>

Its durability, it would seem, procured this material the preference, at least for public use. The library which Pamphilus the Martyr founded for the church at Caesarea, was already considerably damaged in the fourth century, and in order to preserve it from destruction, the two Presbyters Acacius and Euzojus re-wrote upon parchment those works which especially needed to be re-written.<sup>2</sup>

Wealthy individuals caused the skins to be made very thin, and moreover frequently ornamented MSS. of the New Testament as articles of show. Some, says Chrysostom indignantly, possess the sacred books, and have them as if they had them not; they shut them up in their book-chests; they pay attention only to the thinness of the skins and the elegance of the letters; they use them less for reading than for show; less admiration is excited by the contents than by the gilded characters.<sup>3</sup>

This material lasted till sometime in the eleventh century, when cotton paper, βόμβυξ, βόμβας, βομβυκινή, gradually came into general use in the churches.<sup>4</sup>

## § 42.

Books and treatises designed for extended circulation were not written with the abbreviations and marks of the ταχυγράφοι, but were transcribed by the calligraphists in large letters or in the so called uncial character. The ancient letters are exactly square, upright, and unconnected with each other.

On account of its beautiful regularity, this character prevailed without important alteration till about the ninth century; but on this very account it is difficult or rather impossible from the character alone to determine the precise age of any MS. In the ninth century the letters C O Θ lost their round form, and were made narrower to save space; some, as Z Ξ X, were elongated above or beneath the line. Finally, towards the close of the century, the cursive writing came into existence, and was in general use in the tenth century. The first MS. in cursive writing which we meet with belongs to the year 890.<sup>5</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Euseb. Vita Constantini, L. IV. c. 36. Wetsten. Prolog.

<sup>2</sup> Hieronym. Epist. 141. "Quam (bibliothecam) ex parte corruptam Acacius dehinc et Euzojus ejusdem ecclesiae sacerdotes in membranis instaurare conati sunt."

<sup>3</sup> Homil. XXXI. in Joann. p. 202. Ed. Fronteduc. Francof.

<sup>4</sup> Montfaugon Palæographia Graeca, L. I. p. 17. 18. 19.

<sup>5</sup> Montf. Palæog. L. IV. p. 269. 270. Montf. refers to an Evangelium of the year 995 in uncial characters in *Append. ad Palæog.* p. 510. and 514.

But the old character was retained in the MSS. of the New Testament longer than in any other. The Vatican Codex N. 354 is in uncial letters, and yet it was not written till the tenth century, in the year 949, according to the superscription.<sup>1</sup> The text of the beautiful Moscow fragment of the Gospel of John,<sup>2</sup> and of the Moscow MS. called *Cod. g* in Matthæi, containing the Pauline and Catholic Epistles,<sup>3</sup> as also that of the Ingolstadt MS. of the four Gospels, is written throughout in uncial characters, although the cursive-writing was then customary, as is shown by the Scholia annexed to them.

It would seem that this alphabet was retained yet longer in church-copies, Evangelistaria, and all such MSS. as it was wished should have a splendid appearance; for the MSS. of the New Testament of the tenth century written in the cursive-hand form by far the greater number.

### § 43.

The New Testament originally had no marks of punctuation, and remained without them for a long time. As was the case in works of profane literature, the words were not even separated from each other by any interval. All the letters were united together so that every line resembled a single word. Thus in reading a person was obliged to separate and combine the letters, in order to form words and make out the sense.

Hence we meet with singular divisions and combinations of words in some of the fathers, versions, and MSS. E. g. Chrysostom presents the words 1 Cor. 6: 20, *δοξάσατε δὲ ἄρα τὸν θεόν* (as some MSS. read,) in this manner: *δοξάσατε δὲ ἄρατε τὸν θεόν*. So too the Latin translator has it; "portate deum." Again, in Phil. 1: 1, *σὺν ἐπισκόποις* is read by some of the fathers *συνεπισκόποις* and commented on accordingly; and in Philip. 2: 4, *ἐκαστοι σκοποῦντες* is divided by *Cod. Boernerian*. thus: *ἐκαστοῖς κοποῦντες*. The noted Codex L, in Luke 24: 34, has formed the reading *ῶφθης ἡμῶν* from *ΩΦΘΗΣΙΜΩΝ*. In 1 Cor. 9: 12, Mill divides *ΟΥΚ ΕΧΡΗΜΕΘΑ*, as it appears in the *Codex Alexandrinus* thus, *οὐ κεκρήμεθα* but Wetstein, *οὐκ ἐχρήμεθα*, &c. &c.

In the fourth and even fifth century the New Testament had none of the ordinary punctuation marks, although there was no want of grammarians in Christendom to exercise their art in this matter.

Epiphanius, speaking at the commencement of his book *περὶ μέτρων καὶ σταθμῶν* of accents and other signs which then existed in the Old Testament, names but a single mark of division, viz. the *ὑποδιαστολή*.<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Birch Proleg. in IV. Evang. p. III. IV.

<sup>2</sup> N. T. ex edit. Frid. Matthæi. at the end of Epist. ad Thessal. p. 257. notit. Codd. A specimen of the character is to be found with the Apocalypse.

<sup>3</sup> The description is at the end of Epist. ad Rom. p. 265; and there is a specimen of the text in connexion with the Catholic Epistles.

<sup>4</sup> About the close of the eighth century, George Syncellus does indeed speak of a Biblical MS. which was divided *κατὰ προσωδίαν καὶ στιγμῶν*, and was copied from a MS. which Basilus, the Cappadocian, had revised. (Chronograph. p. 203. Richard Simon Hist. Crit. du Nouv. Testam. p. 417.) But it was only a MS. of the O. T.; and he does not say that the accents and punctuation-marks existed in and were copied from the MS. of Basilus.

In the writings of the New Testament nothing of the kind was known to him. He finds fault with certain persons for finishing the sentence in John 1: 3 with *χωρὶς αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο οὐδὲ ἓν*, and connecting *ὃ γέγονεν* with *ἐν αὐτῇ ζωῇ ἦν*. On this occasion, where the division of the sentence by punctuation-marks must necessarily have been mentioned if it had existed, no allusion is made to them. "They close the sentence incorrectly, divide the reading awkwardly, read falsely," is all which he says against the persons; "it should be read thus," &c. He nowhere says,—“they have displaced the punctuation-marks, they point falsely, the punctuation-marks ought to be arranged thus.”<sup>1</sup>

Some of the more ancient fathers are directly opposed to Epiphanius on this point. Irenaeus closes the passage with *οὐδὲ ἓν* and transfers *ὃ γέγονεν* to the next sentence; and thus also it is cited by the Alexandrian fathers, Clement, Origen, and Athanasius.

Chrysostom on the contrary held this division to be absolutely heretical. We must examine what he says, as otherwise his expression, considered separately from the connexion, might be regarded as evidence of a system of punctuation in his time. "We will not," says he, "like the heretics, place a full stop, (*εἴην τελείαν στιγμὴν ἐπιθήσομεν*), after the words, without him there was nothing made, (*χωρὶς αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο οὐδὲ ἓν*.)"

It might be thought from this expression that the period was in use in MSS. of the New Testament. But the sequel shows that he only speaks in the technical language of the grammarians, and expresses in their manner what was to be done in such a case. He nowhere appeals to the usage of MSS., but, having stated his objections drawn from the connexion and from the inconsistency of the sense with the rest of the Christian doctrines, he proceeds: "Let us then leave this, and pass to the usual mode of reading and expounding the passage. And what is that? It is *to stop in reading* with the word *γένονεν*, and then *to begin the next sentence with the following words*, viz. *in him was life*."<sup>2</sup>

Thus every one divided the sentences according to his own opinion and according to his skill in reading, there being no established method to serve as a standard; and that division which Epiphanius regarded as a sin against the Holy Ghost, is found in the writings of the Orthodox Athanasius.

We will now cite some further instances from the Epistles, in which the commentators divide differently whenever differences are possible. Theodoret divides 1 Cor. 15: 32 thus: *τί μοι ὄφελος, εἰ νεκροὶ οὐκ*

<sup>1</sup> Νομίονσι δὲ παραγινώσκοντες καὶ μὴ νοοῦντες διαστέλλειν τὴν ἀνάγνωσιν τινες ἐν τῷ εἰπεῖν πάντα δι' αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο, καὶ χωρὶς αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο οὐδέν· ἕως ὧδε ἀποτιθέντες τὸ ῥητὸν ἐπὶ οἷαν βλάσφημον εἰς τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον λαβόντες, σφαλλονται περὶ τὴν ἀνάγνωσιν, καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ σφάλματος τῆς ἀναγνώσεως σά·ονσιν εἰς βλάσφημίαν τρεπόμενοι. Ἡ δὲ ἀνάγνωσις οὕτως ἔχει. Ancorat. Ed. Basil. p. 501 and Edit. juxta Petav. Colon. c. 74. 75. p. 80. The division which Epiphanius proposes differs from both the others in having no plausibility at all. He proposes: *οἷδε ἓν ὃ γέγονεν ἐν αὐτῷ*, and explains it thus: *τοῦτ' ἐστὶν ὅτι, εἴ τι γέγονε, δι' αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο*.

<sup>2</sup> Homil. IV. in Joann. p. 42. 43. Frontoduc. Francof. Διὸ ταύτην ἀφέντες ἐπὶ τὴν νενομισμένην ἔλθομεν ἀνάγνωσιν τε καὶ ἐξηγήσιν. Τίς δὲ ἐστὶν αὐτή· τὸ μέχρι τοῦ ὃ γέγονεν, ἀναπαύσαι τὸν λόγον· εἰτα ἀπὸ τῆς ἐξῆς λέξεως ἀρξασθαι τῆς λεγούσης, ἐν αὐτῷ ζωὴ ἦν.

ἐγείρονται; Chrysostom concludes the previous sentence with τί μοι ὄφελος and arranges the next thus: εἰ νεκροὶ οὐκ ἐγείρονται, γάγομεν κ. τ. λ. The latter concludes Rom. 8: 20, with ὑποτάξαντα and then begins the 21st verse with ἐπ' ἐλπίδι; but the former joins together ὑποτάξαντα ἐπ' ἐλπίδι. In 1 Cor. 3: 18, Theodoret connects σοφός εἶναι ἐν ὑμῖν ἐν τῇ αἰῶνι τούτῳ, and explains it, σοφίαν τοῦ κόσμου—Chrysostom reads ἐν τῷ αἰῶνι τούτῳ μωρός γινέσθω and explains it μωρὸν κόσμῳ τούτῳ κελεύει γένεσθαι. Theodoret ends Coloss. 1: 11, μακροθυμίαν μετὰ χαρᾶς. Chrysostom ends with μακροθυμίαν and then begins μετὰ χαρᾶς εὐχαριστοῦντες. Not to accumulate examples, we will content ourselves with noticing two passages in Jerome. In his commentaries, which it is well known he composed with the aid of Greek MSS., he says on Ephes. 1: 5, "this may be read in two different ways; the expression in *caritate* may either refer back to the preceding clause, or may be connected with the following," etc.<sup>1</sup> He observes in like manner on Philemon 4, 5, that "the word *semper* may be assigned either to the first or second clause; that it is a doubtful case, both ways making sense."<sup>2</sup> How could this be, if the limits of the clauses were defined by established punctuation?

Theodoret, in his commentaries, sometimes suggests how in his opinion certain doubtful passages ought to be pointed. In 2 Cor. 1: 3, εὐλογητὸς ὁ θεὸς καὶ πατὴρ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, he advises that a stop should be made, ἐνταῦθα στικτέον, after εὐλογητὸς ὁ θεός, lest the meaning should be understood to be, *the God of Jesus Christ*. And in the noted passage, 2 Cor. 4: 4, according to him a stop should be made, ἐνταῦθα ὑποστικτέον, after ἐν οἷς ὁ θεός. Also in Rom. 9: 22, after εἰ δέ there should be a stop; ἐνταῦθα ὑποστίξαι δεῖ· as if Paul began to say: *if it be so*—then hear—*God willing to show his wrath, &c.*

However incorrect any of these proposals may be, they yet lead us to remark, that here and there in particular passages a punctuation mark may very probably have been added by careful readers of the Bible, according to the directions of the fathers. Thus, e. g., we see that two very ancient MSS., neither of which is divided throughout by punctuation marks, in that *locus vexatus*, John 1: 3, have a period after χωρὶς αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο οὐδὲ ἓν, according to the usage of the Alexandrian fathers.<sup>3</sup>

When we call to mind the seriousness with which Epiphanius charged this division of the clauses with blasphemy and Chrysostom with her-

<sup>1</sup> Comment. in Ep. ad Ephesios. ad h. l. "Dupliciter legendum, ut caritas vel cum superioribus vel inferioribus copuletur. Cum superioribus ita: ut essemus sancti et immaculati coram ipso in caritate, et postea sequatur prædestinans nos. . . cum inferioribus autem sic: in caritate prædestinans nos in adoptionem filiorum per Jesum Christum in ipsum. Differentiam vero Græci sermonis προορίσας et ὁρισθέντος Latinus sermo non explicat."

<sup>2</sup> Comment. in Ep. ad Philem. v. 4, 5. "Ambigue vero dictum, utrum gratias agat Deo suo *semper*, an memoriam ejus faciat in orationibus suis *semper*. Et utrumque intelligi potest."

<sup>3</sup> These are Codex Alexandrin. and Cantabrigiens. See Herbert Marsh's (now Bishop of Landaff) Notes and additions to Michaelis' Introduction, Vol. I. p. 456, 457.



easy—when we recollect the ancient dispute respecting 2 Cor. 4: 4, we perceive the reason why no scholar or grammarian presumed to point the New Testament throughout. He might very easily, contrary to his intentions, favor an error in doctrine or involve himself in controversies which he would rather avoid. Thus, as this business was encompassed with so many difficulties, it was postponed to another period.

## § 44.

It was however a very difficult task for a reader who was not possessed of considerable learning to read the Bible in the public assemblies properly and intelligibly without marks of *division*; and even in private reading, some assistance was desirable. To obviate the inconvenience which was felt, the Alexandrian deacon Euthalius conceived the idea of making a division *κατὰ στίχους*, and this method was soon extensively adopted.<sup>1</sup>

The plan which he introduced was to place just so many words in one line, as, in order to express the sense clearly, should be read without any pause. We will present an example from the celebrated fragment of the Pauline Epistles which Wetstein has designated by the letter H.<sup>2</sup> The passage is Titus 2: 2, 3.

ΠΡΕΣΒΥΤΑΣ ΝΗΦΑΛΙΟΥΣ ΕΙΝΑΙ  
ΣΕΜΝΟΥΣ  
ΣΩΦΡΟΝΑΣ  
ΥΠΑΙΝΟΝΤΑΣ ΤΗ ΠΙΣΤΕΙ  
ΤΗ ΑΓΑΠΗ  
ΠΡΕΣΒΥΤΙΔΑΣ ΩΣΑΤΤΩΣ  
ΕΝ ΚΑΤΑΣΤΗΜΑΤΙ ΙΕΡΟΠΡΕΠΕΙΣ  
ΜΗ ΔΙΑΒΟΛΟΥΣ  
ΜΗ ΟΙΝΩ ΠΟΛΛΩ ΔΕΔΟΥΤΩΜΕΝΑΣ  
ΚΑΛΟΔΙΔΑΣΚΑΛΟΥΣ.

This he called *στιχηδὸν γράψαι*, and this way of writing *στιχομερίαν*. At the end of each biblical book was marked the number of *Stichoi* it contained.

He finished the Pauline Epistles in this way in the year 462, for he himself in speaking of Paul's death in the Prolegomena to his Epistles,<sup>3</sup> incidentally states this to have been the time from the birth of Christ to his own days. Soon after, he commenced dividing the Acts and the Catholic Epistles also in the same way. We do not however possess any treatise which gives an account of his procedure as to the Gospels; it may have perished or may lie unnoticed in the libraries. The idea appears

<sup>1</sup> He describes his project himself in a treatise which Laur. Alex. Zacagni has published in the *Collec. Mon. Vet. Eccles. Græc. Ramæ*. 1698, 4. and Gallandus in *Biblioth. Patr. et Antiq. Scriptor. Tom. X. Venet.* 1774. fol.

<sup>2</sup> *Biblioth. Coislinian. Montfauc.* p. 259. I have corrected some mistakes which the copyist made in the division.

<sup>3</sup> Zacagni *Collect. Monum. Vet.* p. 537. Galland. *Biblioth. Patr. T. X.* p. 250.

to have been suggested to him by the so called *στιχηρεῖς βίβλοι* of the Old Testament, Job, the Psalms, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes and Solomon's Song, which had long been so written.<sup>1</sup>

He put this plan in execution in order to secure perspicuity in public reading according to his own mode of dividing the clauses.<sup>2</sup> And indeed the necessity of some such aid to the unlearned was so clearly seen that the Euthalian division was very extensively adopted or imitated. In Egypt, where it appeared under the patronage of the patriarch, to whom it was dedicated, it could not fail of a favorable reception; but elsewhere also it met with so many patrons, that we are now in possession of stichometrical MSS. of every country and Recension.<sup>3</sup> The greater part of them do not indeed retain the *Stichoi*; but they contain a catalogue of them at the end of every book; a convincing proof that they are copies of stichometrical MSS. This circumstance is of use in determining the age of the MSS. which were the originals of such copies.

It sometimes happens too, that besides the number of the *στίχων*, that of the *ῥημάτων* likewise is given. In all MSS. the number of *ῥημάτων* is not much larger than that of the *στίχων*; it would therefore be

<sup>1</sup> Suiceri Thesaur. V. *Στιχηρόν*, p. 1020.

<sup>2</sup> Κατὰ τὴν ἑμαντοῦ συμμετρίαν πρὸς εὐσημον ἀνάγνωσιν. Zacagni Mon. Vet. p. 409. 419.

<sup>3</sup> Nicephorus, patriarch of Constantinople, has appended to his Chronography a list of the *Stichoi* in each of the books of the New Testament. (Montfaucon Biblioth. Coisliniana. p. 204. Millius Prolegom. in New Testament n. 1030.) The following MSS. are written stichometrically, viz. *Cod. D. Cantabrig. Evang. et Act.*, *Cod. D. Epistol. Claromont.*, *E. Sangermanens.* *H. Coislinian.*, *E. Actor. Laudianus*, III. *Cod. G. Evangel. Harleian.* 5684, *Cod. G. Actor. et Epist. Cath. Cardin. Passionei.* 72. The following, and probably many others which have not been examined as to this point, have at least the number of *Stichoi* subjoined at the end: Wetstein's No. 9. of the Gospels, and 13, 35, 39, 41, 45, 46, 48, 50, (in Mill. *Laudian.* I.) 55, 61, 104, 116, 117.—Acts and Cath. Ep. 30. Paul. 36.—Acts Cath. Ep. 25. Paul. 31.—Paul. 46, 47.—Acts and Cath. Ep. 17. Paul. 18.—Acts, Cath. Ep. 33. Paul. 39.—Paul. 65. in Griesbach. In Matthæi, who has omitted to notice the circumstance in the description of his MSS., the following have a list of *Stichoi* at the end of each book; viz. *d*, *k*, *p*, *z*, of the Gospels; *a*, *m*, *n*, *g*, of the Epistles. In Birch: *Vat.* 354, 360, 356. *Urbino-Vat.* 2, *Barberin.* 10, 12, 13, 208. *Basilidian.* XXII. *Escorial.* 9, 10, 12. Of the Acts, *Vat.* 367. *Pio-Vat.* 50. Of the Epistles *Augustinian.* 1, 2. *Vat.* 360, 367. *Alex.-Vat.* 29. *Urbino-Vat.* 3. Florentine MSS. (on the authority of Père Lami): the New Testament in *Bibl. D. Marci Dominic.* Gospels, *Bibl. D. Marc. Dom.* and *Laurentian.* *Plut.* VI. n. 15. *Plut.* VI. n. 16. *Plut.* VI. 33. Gospels in *Biblioth. B. Mariæ*, and *D. Marc. ex hered. Nicol. de Nicoliiis.* Acts and Epistles in *Biblioth. Laurent.* *Plut.* IV. n. 32. and *Biblioth. S. Mariæ Benedictin.* MSS. in the Royal Library at Vienna: Gospels, *N. VI. Auctuar.* *Forlos.* XVI. *Supplem. Kollar*—*Lambec.* XXXI. Epistles, *Lambec.* XXXIV.—XV. *Forlos.* V. *Kollar.*—*Lambec.* XXXVII.—*Lambec.* XXXV.—*Lambec.* XXXVI.—XIX. *Forlos.* X. *Kollar.* The Gospels n. 9 and 48 in Wetstein have both *ῥήματα* and *στίχους* together; so *Barberin.* 12. and in Birch. *Basilidian.* XXII. *Escorial.* 9 and 12. Comp. Richard Simon's *Hist. Crit. du Texte du Nouv. Testament*, c. 32. Salmas. *Proleg. in Solin.* on the last page. As far as I know, *ῥήματα* are marked only in the Gospels. May it not be that Euthalius divided the Gospels stichometrically, and that some one else who adopted this division called his *Stichoi*, *ῥήματα*? The transcribers, in order not to give these lines one name in the Gospels and another in the other books, may afterwards have changed the word *ῥήματα* into *στίχους*. Hence in some MSS. there were *στίχοι* and in others *ῥήματα*, and finally both *ῥήματα* and *στίχοι* got into the copies together.

erroneous to regard the *ῥήματα* as words. They can hardly be anything but clauses like the *στίχοι*; and it would seem that the latter were called in some countries by a different name—that they were denominated *ῥήματα*. Now copyists who had more than one MS. before them to collate, copied the *ῥήματα* from one and the *στίχους* from the other together, without understanding what they were doing. Nor must we be surprised that the number of the *Stichoi* is not given alike in different MSS. or that the number of *στίχων* and *ῥημάτων* does not exactly agree. A MS. had more or less clauses in its text according as it belonged to this or that recension, and thence this disagreement necessarily resulted.

### § 45.

We indeed know when Stichometry arose, viz. in the middle of the 5th century, but we do not know when it ceased. How it ceased and how it suggested the idea of a regular system of punctuation, we are informed by a fine critical document, the *Codex Cyprius* or *Colbert 5149*, now N. 63 in the Library of France, in Wetstein K.

The stichometrical mode of writing left more than half the space unoccupied and made MSS. unnecessarily costly and cumbrous. In order to gain room and yet not lose the *Stichoi*, a point was placed after every *Stichos* and the MS. was written continuously as formerly.

It is thus that the Cyprian Codex is written. After a *Stichos*, or after as many words as are to be read at once or in a single breath in reading correctly, a point is placed, without any reference to the principles of grammatical division or the rules of punctuation. We see this very clearly in the specimen in Montfaucon: *Ὁ δὲ ἐξευθεῖς. παρέλαβε τὸ παιδίον. καὶ τὴν μητέρα αὐτοῦ. καὶ ἦλθεν εἰς γῆν Ἰσραὴλ. Ἀκούσας δὲ. ὅτι Ἀρχελαὸς βασιλεύει ἐπὶ τῆς Ἰουδαίας. ἀντὶ Ἰησοῦ τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτοῦ. ἐφοβήθη ἐκεῖ ἀπελθεῖν. χρηματισθεὶς δὲ. . . .* Matt. 2: 21, 22.<sup>1</sup>

This, as every one will perceive, is strictly stichometrical; but so completely ungrammatical, that no one could be tempted to call it punctuation.

Yet from this originated continuous and regular punctuation. Intelligent persons naturally disliked such a method of division, and began to improve it and insert regular marks of punctuation. For, that several attempted this independently of each other, is clear as well from the dissimilarity prevailing in their arrangement of clauses, as from the difference in the marks themselves which occur in the MSS. There are MSS. which employ a cross instead of a period; as *Cod. L* or 2861, now No. 62 in the Library of France, and *Cod. Vat.* 354, also *Cod. h* in Matthæi. Others use it instead of almost all the punctuation marks, as *Vatic.* 1067, *Colbert.* 700. The *Codex Vaticanus* 351 almost always makes use of two points one above the other, instead of punctuation marks. The division is made in a different manner in the beautiful Basle MS. *E*, in which a point at the top of a letter denotes a period, at the bottom, a comma, and in the middle a semicolon, which according

<sup>1</sup> Montfaucon. *Paleogr. Græc.* L. III. c. 6. p. 232.

to Isidore of Seville is the regular system of punctuation.<sup>1</sup> Others have, besides the point, the comma, as *Cod. V.* in *Matthæi*.

In this business the commentaries of the fathers upon doubtful passages seem to have been made use of, by those copyists or grammarians who went to work with care.

But through whom and where all this took place we can the less easily determine, because it took place only gradually and imperceptibly. It is indeed true that in the 10th century a regular system of punctuation had been introduced. It is no less true, that it is met with in MSS. of the New Testament which belong to the 9th century. Nor does it seem to me that he who should even maintain that it sometimes occurred in MSS. of the 8th century, would encounter any incontrovertible arguments against his position.

### § 46.

The accents are far older than regular punctuation in the writings of the New Testament; and in those of the Old Testament, they existed still earlier than in the New.

In the fourth century and probably before, certain persons, *τινές*, had already furnished the sacred books of the Old Testament with accents. Epiphanius tells us this at the commencement of his work *Περὶ μέτρων καὶ σταθμῶν*, and also, in the same place, names all the accents, *ὀξεῖα, δασεῖα, βαρεῖα, ψιλή, &c.* with which the Bible had been decorated. The writing of the accents he calls *στίζειν κατὰ προσῳδίαν*.

It is possible that the books of the New Testament also were sometimes thus early furnished with accents, but it was Euthalius who brought the accents into general use along with stichometry. He informs us in the preface to his stichometrical edition of the Acts and Catholic Epistles, that he had also written them *κατὰ προσῳδίαν*.<sup>2</sup> Montfaucon, therefore, was unnecessarily troubled in respect to the antiquity of the stichometrical MSS. *Claromont. D Epist. Paul.* and *Coislinian. H*, and need not, in order to sustain their credit, have resorted to the supposition that the accents were added by a later hand.

The general notion respecting the late use of the accents in the New Testament, is derived from profane criticism, and has occasioned inaccurate opinions respecting several documents.

Notwithstanding, even after the time of Euthalius, copyists frequently omitted the accents in stichometrical MSS., for convenience' sake or for other reasons.

### § 47.

The books of the New Testament in MSS. have various titles and subscriptions, which, among the minor circumstances in relation to the text, are not unworthy of our attention. The first book is sometimes superscribed: *Τὸ κατὰ Ματθαῖον εὐαγγέλιον*, or: *Εὐαγγέλιον κατὰ*

<sup>1</sup> Isidor. Hispalens. Origenes, L. I. c. 19.

<sup>2</sup> *Εὐαγγος ἐμοί γε, τὴν τε τῶν πράξεων βίβλον ἅμα καὶ καθολικῶν ἐπιστολῶν ἀναγνῶναι τε κατὰ προσῳδίαν, κ. τ. λ.* Zacagni, p. 409. Galland, T. X. p. 201.



Ματθαῖον, Κατὰ Ματθαῖον ἅγιον εὐαγγέλιον, Τὸ ἅγιον εὐαγγέλιον τοῦ κηρύγματος Ματθαίου τοῦ ἀποστόλου, &c.

Of what date are these superscriptions? The freedom used in regard to them leads us at once to suspect that they did not come from the author himself. This is very evident in regard to the Epistles of Paul. He certainly would not have written upon his letters: 'The first to the Corinthians, The second to the Thessalonians, &c. Such an enumeration could have been made only at the time when the Epistles began to be collected together.

Marcion, who acknowledged Luke's Gospel under certain modifications as his own, affixed no name to it at all. So says Tertullian, and then proceeds: "Would it indeed have been very much out of the way, if he had contrived a new title for it, after altering the contents according to his fancy? How can we acknowledge a work which dares not lift up its head, which evinces so little confidence that it does not claim credit by an avowal of its author?"<sup>1</sup>

And now in order to confute him, he does not, as would perhaps be expected, maintain that Matthew and Luke prefixed their names to the Gospels themselves; but relies upon the testimony of apostolical churches, and of those which were connected with them by religious agreement, which from the publication up to that time had declared Luke to be the author.<sup>2</sup>

Just so when Marcion altered the superscription of the Epistle to the Ephesians and gave it the title, *To the Laodiceans*,—he appeals against him to the declaration of the churches, according to which the Epistle was directed to the Christians at Ephesus.<sup>3</sup>

It is therefore extremely probable that the titles were prefixed by the churches to which these writings were sent, and when the latter were united in one Codex the titles were retained.

Chrysostom asserts without limitation, that not one of the Evangelists subjoined his name. "Moses," says he in his first Homily on the Epistle to the Romans, "wrote five books, and prefixed his name to neither; nor did those who related events after him; neither did Matthew, nor John, nor Mark, nor Luke. But Paul mentions himself by name—and why? As the former wrote for those who were with them, it was unnecessary to annex their names; but Paul wrote his Epistles while at a distance," &c.<sup>4</sup>

Yet this same father so far makes an exception in respect to Matthew as to assert, that he himself prefixed the designation *Gospel* to his book.<sup>5</sup> This statement is so natural, so consistent with the purpose of Matthew and with the circumstances in which he wrote, as we have shown in its proper place,—his work is so completely a book of tidings respecting the Messiah, in other words a *Gospel*, that the Apostle could not announce it better, or more effectually induce the inhabitants of Palestine to read and ponder it, than by writing at the head of it: *ΕΥΑΓΓΕΛΙΟΝ*.

<sup>1</sup> L. IV. Adv. Marcion. c. 2.

<sup>2</sup> L. IV. Adv. Marcion. c. 5.

<sup>3</sup> L. V. Adv. Marcion. c. 11.

<sup>4</sup> Richard Simon. Hist. Crit. du Texte du N. T. c. 2.

<sup>5</sup> Homil. I. in Matt. Praef. Διὰ τοῦτο εὐαγγέλιον τὴν ἱστορίαν ἐκάλεσεν, κ. τ. λ.

When afterwards other writings of similar purport took their places with this, Christians, in order to prevent confusion, added to the word *εὐαγγέλιον*—*κατὰ Ματθαῖον*. The name *εὐαγγέλιον* passed from Matthew to the rest, as the similarity in contents seemed to justify the designation. To these, too, in order to distinguish them, it was necessary to add the name of the writer, *κατὰ Μάρκον, κατὰ Λουκᾶν*.

Thus the oldest fathers cite them, not as *the Gospel of Matthew*, or *of Mark*, but *according to Matthew, according to Mark*.<sup>1</sup> For these writings were not regarded as separate works, which in different directions conspired to the same end, but as parts of one whole, which were indeed distinct as respected the writers, but united to represent a single subject. It is for this reason that the ancients often speak as if there was but *one Gospel*. They call it a *quadri-form Gospel*, or *the one by four*, &c.<sup>2</sup>

The ancients took care to repeat the title at the end of a roll or book, so that if the beginning, which was most exposed to injury, suffered any damage, information respecting the author and title of the work might be found at the end. This is the case also in the Herculean MSS.<sup>3</sup> Hence arose the subscriptions to the books of the New Testament, which were originally only repetitions of the superscription or title: e. g. *εὐαγγέλιον κατὰ Ματθαῖον, Παύλου πρὸς Ῥωμαίους ἐπιστολή*, and sometimes only *πρὸς Ῥωμαίους, πρὸς Κορινθίους, α', β', &c.*

Such perhaps was the character of these titles and subscriptions for some centuries. But when the fathers composed commentaries on the New Testament, they began to pay attention to the time and the historical circumstances in which individual books were written. Thus Chrysostom and Theodoret, in the prefaces to their Expositions of the Pauline Epistles, have inferred, from a comparison of various passages in them with each other and with the Acts, the place and circumstances in which they were written.

The author of the Synopsis which is commonly ascribed to St. Athanasius, gives the following places as those in which Paul's Epistles were written; *τὴν πρὸς Ῥωμαίους ἐπιστέλλει ἀπὸ Κορίνθου, τὴν πρὸς Κορ. α'. ἐπιστέλλει . . . ἀπὸ Ἐφέσου τῆς Ἀσίας, τὴν πρὸς Κορ. β' . . .*

<sup>1</sup> Thus Irenaeus cites *τὸ κατὰ Λουκᾶν εὐαγγέλιον*. L. III. Adv. Haeres. c. 5. n. 8. Clem. Alex. L. I. Strom. *Ἐν τῷ κατὰ Ματθαῖον εὐαγγελίῳ, ἐν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ τῷ κατὰ Λουκᾶν*. p. 341. and 340. Sylb.

<sup>2</sup> Ignat. Epist. ad Philadelph. § 6. *Προσφυσῶν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ ὡς σαρκὶ Ἰησοῦ, καὶ τοῖς ἀποστόλοις ὡς προεβυτηρίῳ τῆς ἐκκλησίας*. Irenaeus L. III. Adv. Haer. c. 11. *Τετραμορφον εὐαγγέλιον ἐν ἐνὶ πνεύματι*. Origen. Comm. in Joann. *Καὶ τὸ ἀληθὺς διὰ τεσσάρων ἐν ἑστὶ εὐαγγέλιον*. Ed. Huet. Colon. T. II. p. 91. Dial. contra Marc. Sect. I. p. 9. Wetsten. *Εὐαγγελιστὰὶ μὲν τέσσαρες, εὐαγγέλιον δὲ ἓν . . . εἰ δὲ τέσσαρες περὶ ἐνὸς λέγουσιν, οὐκ ἐστὶ τέσσαρες, ἀλλὰ ἓν*. Villosion compares with this the custom of the Greeks in not saying *Ὅμηρος τοῦ Ζηνώδοτον, τοῦ Ἀριστάρχου*, but *κατὰ Ζηνώδοτον, κατὰ Ἀρίσταρχον*. Praefat. in Scol. Venet. in Iliad. p. XXIII. Bertholdt thinks that there is an ellipsis: *εὐαγγέλιον*, i. e. *Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ*, so that a second genitive would have been improper and *κατὰ Ματθαῖον* was said and written. Einleit. in das N. T. III. Th. § 298.

<sup>3</sup> John Winkelmann's "Nachrichten von den neuesten Herculanischen Entdeckungen an H. Fuessli." Dresden. 1764. p. 51. 2. See also *Herculanensium Voluminum T. I. Neapol.* 1793. fol. Col. XXXVIII. p. 193. and *Tom. II.* 1809. Col. XI. p. 25.

ἐπιστέλλει ἀπὸ Μακεδονίας, πρὸς Γαλάτας . . . ἐπιστέλλει ἀπὸ Ῥώμης' so also Ephesians, Colossians, Philippians, Philemon, all from Rome. The first to the Thessalon. ἐπιστέλλει ἀπὸ Ἀθηναίων' the second, ἀπὸ Ῥώμης again; that to the Hebrews ἀπὸ Ἰταλίας' the first to Timothy ἀπὸ Μακεδονίας' the second ἀπὸ Ῥώμης' that to Titus ἀπὸ Νικοπόλεως.

Short observations of this kind, it would seem, were sometimes written at the end of the Epistles, and thus extended the subscriptions. Some additional scraps of erudition in regard to the Gospels and other books, were disposed of in the same way.

But the subscriptions did not obtain a definite form till the middle of the fifth century. Euthalius then gave them such a form in his stichometrical edition of the New Testament. In fact, (and it ought not to have escaped the notice of the editor of Euthalius,) he has literally transcribed the summaries which are prefixed to the respective books from the Athanasian Synopsis, and with them likewise the places assigned to Paul's Epistles, as we have quoted them above. But in his subscriptions he attributes very different places from these to several Epistles, as being those from which they were sent.

In some of them, it is true, he does not differ from the Synopsis, as, e. g. in the following: πρὸς Ῥωμαίους ἐγράφη, ἀπὸ Κορίνθου διὰ Φοίβης τῆς διακόνου. στίχοι. πικ. πρὸς Γαλάτας ἐγράφη ἀπὸ Ῥώμης. στίχοι. ρξγ. πρὸς Θεσσαλονικεῖς α'. ἐγράφη ἀπὸ Ἀθηνῶν. στίχοι. ρξγ. πρὸς Ἑβραίους ἐγράφη ἀπὸ Ῥώμης διὰ Τυχίκου. στίχοι. τιβ. πρὸς Τίτον τῆς Κρητοῦ ἐκκλησίας πρῶτον ἐπίσκοπον χειροτονηθέντα ἐγράφη ἀπὸ Νικοπόλεως τῆς Μακεδονίας. στίχων. ρς. In others, however, he varies from him; as, e. g. πρὸς Θεσσαλονικεῖς β'. ἐγράφη ἀπὸ Ἀθηνῶν. στίχοι. ρστ. πρὸς Τιμόθεον α'. ἐγράφη ἀπὸ Λαοδικείας, ἣτις ἐστὶ μητρόπολις Φρυγίας τῆς Πακατιανῆς. στίχων. σλ. He comes nearer in the following: πρὸς Κορινθίους β'. ἐγράφη ἀπὸ Φιλίππων διὰ Τίτου καὶ Λουκα. στίχοι. φξ. He must have found notices of these facts somewhere else, and probably it was in the biblical MSS. themselves. The subscriptions retained this form ever after, and spread in this condition from MS. to MS.

#### § 48.

The New Testament was also divided into certain portions, which appear under various names. The custom of reading it in the public assemblies after the Law and the Prophets, must have led to such divisions. For this purpose the Law and Prophets had already been divided into Parashoth and Haptharoth, and it could not be long before a similar course would be taken with the New Testament. The division into church-lessons was the most ancient.

The Christian fathers called the Jewish sections for reading, *Pericopae*: this expression Justin Martyr makes use of in citing the prophetic books.<sup>1</sup> It occurs also in Clement of Alexandria:<sup>2</sup> and the same

<sup>1</sup> Dialog. cum Tryph. c. 65. c. 72.

<sup>2</sup> Clem. Alex. L. III. Strom. c. 4.

writer also calls the larger sections of the Gospels and Pauline Epistles *περικοπαί*.<sup>1</sup>

Thus the Pericopae were nothing but *ἀναγνώσματα*, church-lessons, or sections of the New Testament which were read in public after Moses and the Prophets.

In the third century there occurs another division into *κεφάλαια*. Dionysius of Alexandria speaks of these on occasion of the disputes respecting the Apocalypse. "Some," says he, "went through the whole book, chapter by chapter, endeavoring to show that it contained no sense."<sup>2</sup>

In the fifth century, Euthalius presents anew a division into chapters, which has been regarded as his own invention. He himself, however, claims only to have composed *τὴν τῶν κεφαλαίων ἐκθεσιν*, the summaries of the chapters in the Acts and the Catholic Epistles.<sup>3</sup> In respect to the Epistles of Paul, not even these are his, but, as he himself says, they originated with one of the wisest of the fathers and followers of Christ, and he himself only incorporated them with his stichometrical New Testament.<sup>4</sup> Thus the chapters must have existed before Euthalius, as the father alluded to had composed summaries of them. But how ancient they are we cannot readily determine.<sup>5</sup>

The Euthalian *κεφάλαια* are distinguished from the *Pericopae* or church-lessons by their length. The Jews had divided the Law into 53 Parashoth, according to the number of the Sabbaths there may be in a year. It was nearly in the same way that the Acts, the Catholic and Pauline Epistles were divided according to the Alexandrine ritual, which Euthalius follows in his stichometrical edition; viz. into 56 Pericopae, three more than the *κυριακαὶ ἡμέραι* or Sundays, probably for three festivals, which were perhaps observed at Christmas, Easter, and Whitsuntide. The Gospels naturally had the same number of Pericopae. Such was the case in ancient times in Asia, for Justin says, that Christians there assembled for prayer and reading the Scriptures only on Sunday, *ἐν τῇ τοῦ ἡλίου ἡμέρᾳ*. The whole New Testament being thus divided into so few sections, they were necessarily very large, and hence in Euthalius a Pericopae sometimes comprehends four, five, and even six chapters.

We have spoken as yet of the chapters of the Acts and the Epistles only. In the Gospels we meet with two kinds of *κεφάλαια*, large and

<sup>1</sup> Strom. L. IV. c. 9. L. VII. c. 13. *μεγίστης δ' οὐσῆς τῆς περικοπῆς*. 1 Cor. VI. 1. seq.

<sup>2</sup> Euseb. H. E. L. VII. c. 25.

<sup>3</sup> Zacagni Monum. Inedit. p. 477.

<sup>4</sup> Id. loc. cit. p. 528. *καθ' ἐκάστην δὲ συντόμως τὴν ἐπιστολὴν ἐν τοῖς ἐξῆς προτάξομεν τὴν τῶν κεφαλαίων ἐκθεσιν ἐν τῶν σοφωτάτων τινὶ καὶ φιλοχριστῶν πατέρων ἡμῶν πεποιημένην*.

<sup>5</sup> In Euthalius' Prolegomena to Paul there is a statement of the period from the death of the Apostle to the time of Arcadius and Honorius; and then Euthalius pursues the chronological reckoning down to his own days. The inference has been attempted from this, that the author of these chapters lived under these two Emperors. But Euthalius compiled sometimes from one source and sometimes from another, and we can infer only the antiquity of this statement concerning Paul's death.



small. The small are the Ammonian which Eusebius projected, and according to which he composed his ten Canons, that he might be able to designate in the Monotessaron of Ammonius what belonged to each Evangelist. In his letter to Carpius, he speaks respecting their use and respecting the nature of his ten Canons; and calls his sections sometimes κεφάλαια and sometimes περικοπαι. Matthew contains 355 of them, Mark 236, Luke 342, and John 232.

The other chapters, called the larger from their length, are entirely independent of the former. Matthew contains 68, Mark 49, Luke 83, and John only 18. There are very few MSS. which have not both together.

The author of the larger chapters is unknown, and their date can only be conjectured. In the fourth century Caesarius, probably the brother of Gregory of Nazianzen, was acquainted only with the Ammonian chapters. "We have four Gospels," says he, "which contain one thousand one hundred and sixty-two chapters," &c.<sup>1</sup> Epiphanius in his *Ancoratus* has exactly repeated this passage of Caesarius,<sup>2</sup> which gives the number of the Ammonian, but not of the larger chapters. Chrysostom, too, knew nothing of the latter. In his expositions of Matthew and John he frequently concludes his discourse in the middle of the larger chapters or wherever it happens, and coincides with them only when the Evangelist's history itself exhibits so abrupt a transition as could not but be regarded.

But in Euthymius and Theophylact the larger chapters are the common ones. Though, however, they are not discovered in any older fathers, this is not the earliest trace of their existence. We find them in MSS. which evidently reach back far beyond the times of these two commentators.

Their appropriate name was τίτλος. "The titles and chapters," says Suidas, "differ; Matthew has 68 titles and 355 chapters; Mark 49 titles and 336 chapters; Luke 83 titles and 342 chapters; John 18 titles and 232 chapters."<sup>3</sup> What he here calls chapters are the Ammonian κεφάλαια, and the τίτλοι are what we have denominated the larger chapters, as we see from the number. This we are told also by an old document, viz. Codex L, or 2861, now 62 in the royal library: τὸ κατὰ Ματθαῖον εὐαγγέλιον ἔχει τίτλους ξη. καὶ κεφάλαια τινέ. τὸ κατὰ Μάρκον εὐαγγέλιον τίτλους μη. κεφάλαια σλδ. τὸ κατὰ Λουκᾶν εὐαγγέλιον ἔχει τίτλους πγ. κεφάλαια τμβ. τὸ κατὰ Ἰωάννην εὐαγγέλιον ἔχει τίτλους ιη. κεφάλαια σλα.<sup>4</sup> The errors which occur here are easily corrected and do not properly affect at all the point under consideration.

They were probably called τίτλοι because to each of these chapters a summary or inscription, *Titulus*, was prefixed. That they came from

1 Τέσσαρα ἡμῖν ἵπάρχει εὐαγγέλια κεφαλαίων χλίων ἑκατὸν ἐξήκοντα δύο. Gal-land. Biblioth. Patr. T. VI. Caesar. Dialog. I. Respons. 39.

2 Epiphanius. *Λογ. Ἀγνερωτ.* p. 490. Ed. Basil. Suicer. Thesaur. V. κεφάλαιον. There should indeed be 1165, but some κεφάλαια are controverted.

3 Τίτλος διαφέρει κεφαλαίου. Καὶ ὁ μὲν Ματθαῖος ἔχει τίτλους ξη. κεφάλαια τνε'. ὁ τε Μάρκος τίτλους μη. κεφάλαια τμβ. ὁ δὲ Ἰωάννης τίτλους ιη. κεφάλαια σλβ.

4 Rich. Simon. Hist. Crit. du Texte du N. T. c. 33.

that pious follower of Christ to whom Euthalius ascribes τὴν τῶν κεφαλῶν ἐκθεσιν in the Acts and Epistles, we may rather conjecture than assert. They are found very much alike in the MSS. of all countries and recensions.

Andreas of Cappadocia divides the Apocalypse into 24 λόγους and 72 κεφάλαια.

In the church-lessons, to return to them once more, various alterations took place. As festival days multiplied, the old division could no longer subsist, and in many churches the *Pericopæ* became shorter. At last, as ceremonial observances increased, only certain passages, and these sometimes very short, were selected from the Gospels, the Acts and the Epistles. An entire Codex of this kind was called ἐκλογάδιον; one of the Gospels only, εὐαγγελιστάριον; and one of the other books, προξαπόστολος.

This change seems to have taken place among the Latins much earlier than among the Greeks. Credible witnesses testify to the existence of this arrangement among the former about the middle of the fifth century;<sup>1</sup> a period when nothing of the kind can be discovered among the latter. The term προξαπόστολος does indeed frequently occur in the *Typicum* of St. Sabas,<sup>2</sup> who died in the beginning of the fifth century. But the Greeks do not deny that this *Typicum* or monastic ritual is not his own,—that the latter perished during the incursions of the barbarians, and was rewritten by John Damascenus from recollection.<sup>3</sup> John Damascenus lived about the middle of the eighth century; and I am not aware of any earlier notice of Lectionaria among the Greeks.

Our present chapters, it is well known, come from Cardinal Hugo de Saint Cher, who composed a Concordance in the twelfth century, and for convenient reference divided the Bible into small sections at his pleasure. They are now generally adopted in the editions of the Hebrew and Greek text.

The verses come from Robert Stephens, who introduced them for the first time in his edition of the New Testament in 1551. The place where this was printed is not stated, but it is decorated with the olive of Stephens.

## CHAPTER VI.

### CONCERNING THE MANUSCRIPTS.

#### § 49.

The changes which occurred at different periods in the circumstances and appearance of the text, are so many marks by which to discover

<sup>1</sup> Bingham Orig. Ecclesiast. L. XIV. c. III. § 3.

<sup>2</sup> Leo Allatius De Libris Eccles. Graecorum Diss. I. p. 35. in the Biblioth. Graec. of Fabricius, Appendix to the fifth Book. Hamb. Edit.

<sup>3</sup> Id. l. c. p. 4. 5. Suicer Thesaur. V. τυπικόν.

er the age of MSS. Though they seldom enable us to pronounce decisively as to their precise age, yet we can generally infer from them whether a MS. is or is not as old as is asserted. For this reason we shall find no better place to speak particularly of these valuable bequests of antiquity through which the text has descended to us, than here, immediately after the investigations which comprise the facts that are the basis of our judgment respecting them.

We have, too, other aids in this matter, as e. g. a comparison of the Church-calenders and Diptychs with the festivals which are frequently noted in connexion with the lessons in the MSS.—also the observation of marginal glosses, postscripts of the calligraphists, or other additions which may have been made to any particular MS. But these are individual circumstances which differ in different cases, and therefore cannot be considered and reckoned as general characteristics. They are therefore surrendered to the individual capacity and penetration of critics, some of whom will derive more and some less advantage from them.

Certain historical circumstances which we subjoin may be useful in determining the age of MSS. written in Alexandria. Strabo names two cities in which copies of MSS. were made for sale, *εἰς προῶσιν*, viz. Rome and Alexandria;<sup>1</sup> probably the former dealt in Latin and the latter in Greek literature.

The Alexandrian characters possessed some peculiarities, but we are not informed in what they consisted.<sup>2</sup> Among the calligraphists of this city appear some illustrious names; e. g. Philodemus, who became blind in the practice of his art;<sup>3</sup> Hierakas, who followed his employment with his eyesight unimpaired when over eighty years old;<sup>4</sup> and others down to the times of the Arabians.<sup>5</sup> But, as these times of decay came on, the Greeks withdrew from so laborious a mode of gaining subsistence, preferring rather to harass the country in the capacity of overseers, collectors, and soldiers, and gave up calligraphy to the natives or Copts, as well as all other operations of industry and manual labor.<sup>6</sup> On this account however they were regarded with such hatred, that, after the conquest of Egypt by the Arabian arms in the year 641, the Copts united with the Arabs to expel them totally from the country, and succeeded in their endeavour after the capture of Alexandria.

From this time the Arabians put a stop to the intercourse of Egypt with foreign nations, and especially with the dominions of the Greek emperor,<sup>7</sup> so that the sale of MSS. abroad was rendered impracticable.

<sup>1</sup> Strabo L. XIII. p. 419. Ed. Ima Casaub. Ed. 2da p. 609.

<sup>2</sup> Concil. Constantinop. IV. *Τὸ σύγγραμμα καταρτισθῆναι, ἐπὶ παλαιότητων μὲν τοῦτο χαρτίων γραμμασί Ἀλεξανδρinoῖς, τὴν Ἀρχαίαν ὅτι μάλιστα χειροθεσίαν μοιησάμενος, γράφει.* Collect. Labbei. T. V. p. 1004.

<sup>3</sup> Anthol. Graec. H. Grotii. L. VI. Epigr. Juliani Egyptii, 6 and 7. Brunk Analecta. T. II. p. 495. 96.

<sup>4</sup> Epiphan. Haeres. L. XVII. § 3. p. 712. Ed. Colon.

<sup>5</sup> Theophilact. Simocatta. L. VIII. p. 215. Cedren. T. I. p. 405. Ed. Paris. 1647.

<sup>6</sup> Renaudot. Hist. Patr. Alexandr. Benjamin. Patr. XXXVIII. p. 164.

<sup>7</sup> Renaudot. Hist. Patr. Alexandr. Chail. Patr. XLVII. p. 206. Isaac. XLI. p. 187. Simon Patr. XLII. p. 184.

The destruction of the library, too, at the command of Omar (for this is a well authenticated fact,<sup>1</sup>) entirely deprived the calligraphists of the MSS. from which they made their copies. Both occurrences were highly prejudicial to the art of calligraphy. The first limited the exercise of it to the continually decreasing demand within the country itself; the other robbed it of the hope of ever again rising to much importance even though other circumstances should favor it as before.

After the Greeks were expelled, there remained only one chapel at Alexandria, and a single church with a bishop at Kasser el Shema, devoted to the Greek religious service.<sup>2</sup> The numerous churches they had possessed the Copts appropriated to themselves. At this period there was no demand for Greek copies of the Bible, either for the use of churches or of individuals. This state of things lasted from 641 to 730, when the condition of the Greeks took a more favorable turn, and they again obtained a patriarch in the person of Cosmas, together with the privilege of undisturbed worship and the possession of many of their churches.<sup>3</sup> Here seems to commence the second period of the Greek MSS. of the New Testament written in Egypt.

No one will expect here a description of all the MSS. which are known. This might indeed be required in Prolegomena to a critical edition of the New Testament, the extent of the plan of which called for such particularity. Here however we are only bound to give information respecting those MSS. to which we have referred in our history of the text.

We divide them into three classes: I. such as were antecedent to the practice of stichometry; II. stichometrical; and III. such as were written after stichometry had become extinct.

### § 50.

The oldest MSS. which have come down to us have been, probably more from accident than any thing else, designated by the letters A, B, and C.

*Cod. B*, or *Vatic.* 1209, contains the Old and New Testament; the latter in the following order: Gospels, Acts, Catholic and Pauline Epistles as far as Heb. 9: 14. The Epistles to Timothy, Titus, Philemon, together with the Apocalypse, have been destroyed by time.<sup>4</sup>

The MS. is of the finest parchment, with very simple and beautiful square letters which are invariably uniform and scarce perceptibly larger than the characters in the MS. of Philodemus *περὶ μουσικῆς*, the first of the Herculanean rolls which was unfolded. In other respects, too,

<sup>1</sup> George Keser's (Prof. and Curator of the Gymnasium.) "Programm. über die Bibliothek, welche die Araber zu Alexandrien verbrannten." Freyburg. 1819. 4. p. 2-6.

<sup>2</sup> Renaudot. Hist. Patr. in Chail. Patr. XLVII. p. 205. Eutyech. Alex. Annal. T. II. p. 285-9.

<sup>3</sup> Eutyech. Annal. loc. cit. Renaudot. Hist. Patr. in Cosma.

<sup>4</sup> I have described and criticised this MS. in a Programm, "De antiquitate Codicis Vaticani Commentatio." Friburgi. 1809. 4.



they resemble them extremely.<sup>1</sup> The initial letters do not differ at all from the rest ; a later hand has written larger initials over the original ones.

The letters are all equidistant from each other ; no word is separated from the rest, and each line appears to be but a single word. Where a complete narrative or other long series of sentences terminates, a blank space is left of the breadth of a letter or half a letter.

The MS. has three columns on each page, and when opened presents 6 columns to the eye, so that we are deceived and think we have a book-roll unfolded before us. It would seem as if at that period men were just on the point of passing from the use of rolls to that of books, and there still remained in the latter some resemblance to their previous form. It is therefore much broader than it is long, and in that respect resembles no other Greek document except the celebrated fragment of Dion Cassius, formerly in the possession of Fulvius Ursinus.

The MS. had long since faded so much that it was necessary for a second hand to retouch the characters with new ink. It would even seem that in the Epistle to the Galatians, p. 1491, a third hand undertook to remedy the faintness of the second application of ink. The very faint characters of the first hand have been preserved untouched only where the calligraphist wrote words or whole clauses over a second time. The unnecessary pains of retouching what was written over twice was spared.<sup>2</sup>

So far the characteristics all point to a very high antiquity ; but they are merely general and determine nothing definite.

The punctuation marks are by the second hand and occur but seldom. We may pass through several chapters in the Gospels and Epistles without finding a single one. Even where at the close of a section a space of the breadth of half or the whole of a letter is left blank, no period is inserted. They occur more frequently in some chapters of the Acts. There are no accents in any place where the first writing appears clear and untouched ; they were added by a later hand.<sup>3</sup>

The inscriptions or titles are appended as a matter of small importance to the upper part of the upper margin in a somewhat smaller hand. They are extremely simple, and are found at the top of each page throughout the MS. : *κατὰ Ματθαῖον*, (sic) *κατὰ Μάρκον*, *πράξεις ἀποστόλων*, *Ἰακώβου ἐπιστολή*, *Πέτρου α.*, *Πέτρου β.*, then *πρὸς Ῥωμαίους*, *πρὸς Κορινθίους*, without the name of the author. The subscriptions are mere repetitions of the titles ; what is additional was undoubtedly added by a second hand : after *πρὸς Ῥωμαίους* we find *ἐγράφη ἀπὸ Κορινθίου* ; after *πρὸς Κορινθίους β.* has been added *ἐγράφη ἀπὸ Φιλίππων*, &c. But even these later additions do not recognise the Euthalian inscriptions.

As to the chapters in the Gospels, the Ammonian division is wholly wanting, although it was pretty general about the middle of the fourth

<sup>1</sup> *Herculaneusium Voluminum, quae supersunt. Tom. I. Neapoli MDCCXCIII. ex Reg. Typograph.*

<sup>2</sup> I have selected as specimens two of these passages, John 13: 14. Rom. 4: 4. A pretty good idea of the general appearance of the Codex may be obtained from Blanchin. *Evangeliar. Quadrupl. P. L. ad pag. CDXCII.*

<sup>3</sup> Hug, *De antiquitate Cod. Vatic. commentatio.* p. 9-13.

century. We will not insist very strongly however on this point. Instead of them there are chapters which we find no where else; in Matthew 170, Mark 72, Luke 152, and John 80. The Acts of the Apostles was originally divided only into the Egyptian church-lessons; another hand afterwards added chapters, but not the Euthalian. To the original division of the Catholic Epistles, as in the Acts, another has been added by a later hand; but neither does this accord at all with that made by Euthalius.<sup>1</sup>

The division of the Pauline Epistles is wholly without example. It is not the case that each Epistle has its separate chapters, but all together are considered as a single book, and the chapters are numbered continuously throughout. The Epistle to the Romans ends with the 21st chapter; the first to the Corinthians begins with the 22d chapter and concludes with the 32d; then the second to the Corinthians begins with the 32d chapter, &c. Not only are all these appearances Ante-Euthalian, but some of them are of a character so ancient that they belong very much farther back, and no other trace of them remains.

Two additional peculiarities merit our attention. The Epistle to the Galatians concludes with the 59th chapter; the next, to the Ephesians, commences with the 70th chapter, and then the numbers continue regularly through Philippians, Colossians, and Thessalonians. The second to the Thessalonians ends with the 93d chapter. Now why are the chapters from the 59th to the 70th wanting? Whence this chasm? At the end of the second to the Thessalonians we find the explanation. We here meet with the Epistle to the Hebrews; it begins with the 60th chapter, proceeds with the 61, 62, 63, and 64, as far as Heb. 9: 14, and the rest of the Epistle is lost. We perceive from the numeration of the chapters, that the Epistle to the Hebrews originally stood after that to the Galatians and had been recently placed farther back; but so recently that even the division of the chapters had not yet been altered. The new position of this Epistle after the second to the Thessalonians, is given to it also in the Canon of Athanasius. This transposition of the Epistle was probably made by Athanasius himself out of respect for the Romish church, and the MS. must then have been written near this period, when the transposition was recent. If, however, it were thus placed before the time of Athanasius, the Codex must be assigned to a more ancient period. At all events the change had then but just taken place; while in the fourth century it had become general. Epiphanius informs us as follows: "There are two kinds of biblical MSS. Some of them place the Epistle to the Hebrews after the Epistles to Timothy, Titus and Philemon; while others assign it a place after the second to the Thessalonians."<sup>2</sup>

Basil asserts that formerly in Ephes. 1: 1, the words ἐν Ἐφέσῳ were wanting: so the fathers before him declared, and so he found it in *ancient MSS.* A discussion of this point may be seen in the II<sup>d</sup> Part, (§ 121) where we treat of the Epistle to the Ephesians. Our MS. must have been therefore an ancient one in the time of Basil; for it

<sup>1</sup> De antiq. Cod. Vat. Comment. p. 19-23.

<sup>2</sup> Epiphanius. Haer. XLII. p. 373. Juxta Petav. Colon.

does not contain the words ἐν Ἐφέσῳ in the text: they are only subjoined in the margin, though indeed by the first hand.

The first of these circumstances assigns this Codex to an early period in the fourth century at least; and the other to one certainly considerably antecedent to Basil.

The MS. evinces by its peculiarities of language, that it was written by an Egyptian calligraphist. Instead of συλλήψῃ, λήψεσθε, ληφθήσεται, ἀνελήφθη, we find συλλήμψῃ, λήμψεσθε, λημφθήσεται, ἀνελήμφθη, λημφθέντα, &c. This peculiarity occurs only in Coptic or Graeco-Coptic documents, as in the Graeco-Thebaic litanies of the Borgian museum, in which ἀντιλήψεως is always written ἀντιλήμψεως or ἀντιλήμψεως;<sup>1</sup> in the Alexandrino-Coptic Liturgy, in which εὐμετάληψις becomes εὐμετάλημψις;<sup>2</sup> and in other Coptic fragments, in which λήψανον is written instead of λείψανον; ἀποκάλυψις instead of ἀποκάλυψις.<sup>3</sup>

Further, the Vatican Codex always writes εἶπαν for εἶπον, like the triglott Rosetta inscription, at the end of the eighth line: συναχθέντες ἐν τῷ ἐν Μέμφῃ ἱερῷ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ταύτῃ Εἴπαν; and the Graeco-Thebaic fragment of John 7: 52 in Georgi: ἀπεκρίθησαν καὶ Εἴπαν.<sup>4</sup> Just so it has εἶδαν, ἔπσαν, ἦλθαν, εἰσῆλθαν, and ἀνείλατο, ἐξείλατο, Acts 14: 10 ἦλατο, διαμαρτύρατο, as we find in an inscription on the Memnon of Thebes: ΟΥΛΕΝ ΕΞΕΦΘΕΙΓΑΤΟ;<sup>5</sup> also in Luke 9: 36, ἐώρακαν, and Rom. 16: 7, γέγοναν, as, according to Sextus, the Alexandrians were accustomed to write, using ἐλήλυθαν and ἀπελήλυθαν for ἐλήλυθασι.<sup>6</sup>

Attention should be paid to these observations, inasmuch as we must again recur to them in our judgment respecting other MSS.

Birch collated the Codex throughout, with the exception of the Gospels of Luke and John, for the royal Danish edition of the New Testament. Of the two Gospels we have excepted, he procured a collation which had been made for Bentley. Woide has published in *Appendice Cod. Alexandrini*, the collation of the whole MS. made for Bentley. Nor is this publication unnecessary; for we are very glad to have more than one collation of so important a document.

A (*Alexandrin. Mus. Britannic.*) contains the Old and New Testament. The latter, of which the beginning is destroyed, commences with Matt. 25: 6, ἐξέροχσεσθε εἰς τήν . . . but is thenceforward entire with the exception of John 6: 50—8: 52, and 2 Cor. 4: 13—12: 2. The order of the books is the same as in the *Vat. Cod.* After the Acts come the Catholic Epistles and then Paul; here too the Epistle to the Hebrews takes its place after the second to the Thessalonians. Each page has two columns.

<sup>1</sup> Georgi Fragm. Evang. S. Jo. Graeco-Copto-Thebaicum in Append. p. 358. 59. 362. 64. 66.

<sup>2</sup> Asseman. Cod. Eccles. Univ. Liturg. L. VIII. P. V. p. 13.

<sup>3</sup> Mingarelli Ægypt. Codd. Reliq. in Bib. Naniana. Fasc. 1. p. LXXXIII. This peculiarity is found in MSS. of Herodotus and has been considered as Ionicism. We here see it to be a characteristic of Alexandrian MSS.

<sup>4</sup> Georgi Fragm. Evang. S. Jo. p. 32.

<sup>5</sup> Pocoke's Description of the East. Vol. I. Plat. XXXVIII.

<sup>6</sup> Sextus Empir. Advers. Grammat. I. 20. p. 261.



The characters are elegant, square and upright; larger than in the *Vat. Codex*. The letters are equidistant from each other and the words not separated; the termination of the words is denoted very rarely by a crooked stroke in the top of a letter. Initial letters of larger size are found not only at the beginning of every book, but of every section however short.<sup>1</sup>

The MS. has frequent sections not unlike our verses; somewhat longer however, as a section never ends before the sentence is completed. A blank space of the average length of a single word generally denotes the end of a section.

As respects the punctuation, we might easily fall into a mistake, and regard this Codex as a copy of a stichometrical MS.; yet so written that the lines are continuous, the end of a stichos being always denoted by a dot: e. g. Acts 11: 6, 7, καὶ εἶδον τὰ τετραπόδα τῆς γῆς καὶ τὰ θηρία καὶ τὰ ἔρπεντα καὶ τὰ πετεινὰ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ἤκουσα δὲ φωνῆς λεγούσης μοι ἀναστὰς Πέτρος θύσον καὶ φάγε. There is a very great resemblance between the stichoi and these divisions, hundreds of examples of which occur in the MS.; but in general it does not recognise the divisions μέση and ὑποστιγμή; only using the period, τελεία, throughout at the end of a clause. Each section, even the smallest without distinction, occurs invariably with a point at the top of the letter.

The Codex is entirely without accents and aspirates, and in no one of its characteristics suits the times of Euthalius.

The inscriptions and subscriptions are very simple: εὐαγγέλιον κατὰ Μάρκον; εὐαγγέλιον κατὰ Λουκᾶν. These titles repeated form the subscriptions. The inscriptions of the Acts and Catholic Epistles on the upper margin are almost entirely cut off. The subscriptions are Ἰακωβὸν ἐπιστολή, Πέτρου α, &c. At the end, after the Epistle of Jude, the Acts and Catholic Epistles have a common subscription: πράξεις τῶν ἁγίων ἀποστόλων καὶ καθολικαί, as though they together constituted one book. The subscriptions of the first Pauline Epistles are merely πρὸς Ῥωμαίους, πρὸς Κορινθίους, &c. The subscriptions from the Epistle to the Colossians onwards have something additional: πρὸς Κολοσσαεῖς ἀπὸ Ῥώμης, πρὸς Θεσσαλονικεῖς α. ἐγράφη ἀπὸ Ἀθηνῶν, πρὸς Θεσσαλονικεῖς β. ἐγράφη ἀπὸ Ἀθηνῶν, πρὸς Ἑβραίους ἐγράφη ἀπὸ Ῥώμης, πρὸς Τιμόθεον α. ἐγράφη ἀπὸ Λαοδικείας, πρὸς Τιμόθεον β. ἐγράφη ἀπὸ Λαοδικείας, πρὸς Τίτον γ. ἐγράφη ἀπὸ Νικοπόλεως. None of these subscriptions are the same as those of Euthalius; of the latter class two, viz. those of the Epistle to the Hebrews and the second to Timothy, contradict Euthalius, whose subscriptions are: πρὸς Ἑβραίους ἐγράφη ἀπὸ τῆς Ἰταλίας διὰ Τιμο-

<sup>1</sup> The part of the Codex containing the New Testament has been printed in these same elegant characters, copied and cast for the purpose. "Nov. Testam. Graec. e Cod. Alexan. qui Londini in Bib. Musei Britan. asservatur, descriptum a Godofr. Carolo Woide, etc. Londini ex prelo Joh. Nichols typis Jacksonianis." 1786. fol.

Spohn has edited Woide's Prolegomena in Germany and corrected Wetstein's collation from this edition. "G. C. Woidii notitia Cod. Alex. cum variis ejus lectionibus, curavit Gottl. Leberecht Spohn." Lips. 1788. 8vo.



Θέον· στίχοι ψ. γ. πρὸς Τιμόθεον β. τῆς Ἐφεσίων ἐκκλησίας ἐπίσκοπον χειροτονηθέντα, ἐγράφη ἀπὸ Ρώμης. λ.

As to the chapters, the Gospels have the Ammonian chapters and the sections of Eusebius; and they have also the larger chapters which the Greeks call *τίτλους*. A summary of these chapters and *tituli* is prefixed to the Gospels, and in the text they are generally denoted by numbers and the corresponding inscription added on the upper margin. Thus at Matt. 27: 43, is marked the last chapter, ΞΗ, 68, and the inscription on the upper margin is *περὶ τῆς αἰήσεως τοῦ σωμ. . . . i. e. σώματος Ἰησοῦ*. There are thus in Matthew, as usual, 68 chapters, in Mark 48, Luke 83, and John 18. Respecting the antiquity of these chapters there is at present some uncertainty, so that we must renounce their aid in deciding on the age of this MS.

In the Acts it has been thought, that in five places there is evidence of a division of the books by means of a cross, which is commonly found in the Gospels near the numbers of the large chapters.<sup>1</sup> But the cross certainly has not any meaning of this kind when it stands alone. See e. g. Luke 1: 15, 8: 35, 9: 5, 13: 28, 18: 8, John 4: 6, 4: 41, where it occurs in the middle of the discourse, and even in the middle of a sentence. How can it denote such a division in these cases? Yet, admitting that in the five passages pointed out, Acts 3: 1, 4: 3, 8: 26, 10: 1, 17: 20, it does mark chapters, at any rate they are not the Euthalian. Two of them, Acts 4: 3, and 17: 20, do not at all coincide with the Euthalian sections; and, following Euthalius, there should be forty instead five.

In the Catholic and Pauline Epistles, as also in the Apocalypse, neither the chapters nor lessons are marked. Nothing is to be seen of the plan and contrivances of Euthalius in the whole MS. The character of the punctuation, the total want of accents, the subscriptions of the Pauline Epistles, are, on the contrary, evidence that it was written before the Euthalian innovations or before the last half of the fifth century, and this evidence is the more weighty as the MS. was written in Egypt.

Its peculiarities of language evince this origin. Mark 12: 40, *λήμψονται*, 16: 24, *λήμψεσθε*. Luke 9. 51, 17: 34, John 14: 3, 16: 14, 15, Acts 1: 22, 2: 38, 1 Cor. 12: 28, *ἀντιλήμψεις*. Philipp. 4: 15, *δόσεως καὶ λήμψεως*. Coloss. 3: 24 and Luke 13: 11, *ἀνακύμψαι*. It is true that *εἶπαν* and similar forms of the second Aorist are not so frequent as in the *Vatic. Codex*; but the copyist has not excluded them entirely: as, Luke 19: 39, Acts 1: 24, 6: 2, *εἶπαν*; Mark 14: 48, *ἐξήλθατε*, Luke 11: 54, *εἰσήλθατε*, Acts 10: 39, *ἀνείλαν*.

Cod. C (*n. 9. Regio Parisinus*,) has also been called *Ephraem Syri*, because the old writing was partly effaced with a sponge, and the parchment then used to write certain ascetic treatises of Ephraem upon. The old ink, however, appears notwithstanding very plainly, so that whole sentences can be read with ease with the naked eye. The ancient characters had become obsolete; people had become accustomed to the cursive hand with all its reading- and division-marks, and seized upon old MSS. to apply them to a better purpose.

<sup>1</sup> Praefat. ad Cod. Alexan. § 36. p. vii.

The pages which were used as above stated, contained parts of the Old and, with some considerable exceptions pointed out by Wetstein and Griesbach, the whole of the New Testament, in the same order as in the Vatican and Alexandrian MSS., viz. the Gospels, Acts, Catholic, Pauline Epistles, the Epistle to the Hebrews after the second to the Thessalonians, and the Apocalypse. Much which Wetstein was not able to read, might be made legible by means now in our possession.

The text is not divided into columns. The letters are somewhat larger than those of the Alexandrian MS., beautiful, uniform, upright, and square. The words are not separated. Initial letters are found, as in the *Alex. Cod.*, at the beginning of each book and of the small sections; for, like that, it is divided into small sections like our verses, only somewhat larger.

As to the punctuation-marks—at the end of a sentence a period is commonly found in the form of a cross; the smaller divisions are sometimes regarded, but usually neglected. For a comma a dot is placed at the bottom of a letter, and for a colon, a dot in the middle; but a later hand has almost invariably written in different ink a small cross over these dots, smaller than the cross which represents the period. For example, all the punctuation-marks occur in Matt. 22: 11 and 12; while in verses 13 and 14 there are none, except a period after *ἐκλεκτοί*. In the 15th verse there is but one, viz. after *λόγῳ*; in the 10th there are but two, viz. after *λέγοντες* and after *οὐδένος*. To give some idea of the size of the smallest sections, we will state that verses 11 and 12 together make one, verses 13 and 14 a second, and verses 15, 16, and 17 another.

Such is the case in regard to punctuation-marks; accents are nowhere to be found in the MS.

In the Gospels the Codex has the chapters of Ammonius and the sections of Eusebius. It has likewise the larger chapters and the *τίτλους* or summaries of contents which are connected with them. In the Epistles I observed some divisions agreeing with the Egyptian church-lessons.

The inscriptions and subscriptions could not be more simple than they are, where they are preserved. John's Gospel is subscribed thus: *εὐαγγέλιον κατὰ Ἰωάννην*. The second of Peter has, with no number, the inscription: *Πέτρου καθολικῆς*; the third of John has the superscription, *Ἰωάννου*; Jude, *Ἰούδα ἐπιστολή*, with the subscription, *Ἰούδα καθολικῆς*. In the Pauline Epistles we find preserved the inscription *πρὸς Ῥωμαίους*; the inscription and subscription *πρὸς Κορινθίους α.*; the subscriptions *πρὸς Γαλατίας*, *πρὸς Κολοσσαεῖς*, *πρὸς Ἑβραίους*, *πρὸς Τιμόθεον β.* Neither of these has any thing further; still less do they bear resemblance to those of Euthalius.

In comparing this MS. with the Alexandrian, we find that it has not so many additions attributable to a later hand. Pursuing the comparison with reference to the punctuation-marks, we find that it has far fewer subdivisions by means of commas and colons than the Alexandrian—two weighty reasons for ascribing to it the precedence in point of antiquity.

This Codex, likewise, was written in Alexandria or somewhere in Egypt, as is shown by the forms *λήμψεται*, Matt. 10: 41; *συλλήμψῃ*,

Luke 1: 31; ἀναλήμψεως, Luke 9: 51, ἀνελήμψθη, Acts 1: 2, εἶπαν, Matt. 25: 8, Mark 10: 4, 10: 37, Acts 23: 14; ἤλθατε, Matt. 25: 34; ἐλθάτω Matt. 10: 13, Luke 11: 2.

Wetstein, as we are assured by Less and particularly Griesbach, did all that was in his time possible in collating the MS.; yet it would be worth while to have a gleaning with the aid of our present resources. A fac-simile of the characters is given by Montfaucon (*Paleogr. L III. c. 3, p. 214.*) which however does not equal the elegance of the original.

*Codex S. Matthæi Dublinensis rescriptus.* This MS. is inferior to none in point of beauty. It has been washed over and other works written upon it; but the old letters can still be discerned. John Barret, a clergyman of Trinity College, Dublin, discovered the old writing, had it engraved, and published it in 64 copper-plates with a preface, critical observations and an appendix.<sup>1</sup> Through this splendid work we possess, though with many chasms, the Gospel of Matthew according to the *Recension of Hesychius*. As Griesbach was not acquainted with it, it is not designated in criticism by any letter.

The characters are upright, square and uniform, somewhat larger than those in *Cod. Ephraem*. The *A* and *M* are remarkably similar in form, as we find them to be in Coptic MSS.

The text is subdivided into sections resembling verses, as in the MSS. *A* and *C*: there is but one column on each page.

As to the punctuation—the period is invariably marked, or, where it is effaced, there is a considerable blank space in which it once stood. The colon is not always perceptible; but a space of about half a letter denotes where it is or should be. The smallest division, for which a space is left nearly as large as that for the colon, seldom occurs. All three have the same mark, viz. a dot.

There are no accents; to use the words of him who examined it personally: “nec habet spiritus aut accentus omnino.”

From all the grounds of decision it would appear that the MS. cannot be more modern than the *Codex Ephraem Syri*. To complete its description we must mention further, that it contains the chapters of Ammonius without Eusebius' sections, and also the larger chapters with their inscriptions.

I have met with the following Alexandrian forms of words in the MS.: Matt. 10: 41, λήμψεται; 7: 25, προσέπεσαν; 11: 7, 8, 9, ἐξήλθατε.

## § 51.

*D* or *Codex Cantabr.*, a MS. of the Gospels and Acts, and *E*, a MS. of the Acts alone (*Laudianus III*), belong to the second period and were written after stichometry had become prevalent. Of the Epistles of Paul, *D* and *E*, or *Codex Claromont.* and *Sangermanensis*, and *H*, or *Coislinianus*, are MSS. of the same class.

<sup>1</sup> “Evangelium secundum Matthæum, ex codice rescripto in bibliotheca collegii SS. Trinitatis juxta Dublin, descriptum opera et studio Jo. Barret etc. cui adjungitur appendix collationem codicis Montfortiani complectens.” Dublinii in aedibus academicis. mccccl.



The MS. *D*, containing the Gospels and Acts, was used by Robert Stephens in his edition of the New Testament in 1550, where its readings are occasionally quoted in the margin under the letter  $\beta'$ . Its last possessor, before it passed over to England, was Theodore Beza. The rest of its history lies in obscurity and some of it must forever continue so. At any rate, however, it finally got into good hands. Beza presented it in 1581 to the Cambridge University, where it was held in high estimation and in 1793 was printed in its own characters, which were carefully copied.<sup>1</sup> The pages which are wanting are pointed out by the Editor of the Preface p. XXVI, (but more circumstantially and accurately in the Appendix at the end,) as well as those which were added by other hands in order to supply passages which were lost or for the sake of correction.

The Gospels are in the following order : Matthew, John, Luke, Mark. Then comes the Acts of the Apostles. On one side, the right, is the Greek text, and on the opposite an old Latin version, antecedent to Jerome, both written stichometrically in the (so called) uncial characters. The Greek letters are upright and square, not compressed like the more modern form, but similar to the oldest characters.

The Greek and Latin are by the same hand. This is evident in the letters A and E, in the C of the Latin and the Sigma in the Greek ; it is still more clear in the letter T, the horizontal line of which is made by a peculiar, turn of the pen ; and is especially plain from the Latin P and Greek P in the formation of which the calligraphist had a remarkable peculiarity in which both agree.

The calligraphist, however, knew but little of Greek and as little of Latin. Unskilled in these languages, he wrote his MS. in his professional capacity. He was an Egyptian or Alexandrian. As a Latino-Greek Codex written in Alexandria is somewhat remarkable, we will present the evidence in the case. No Codex, not even the Vatican, has so many Alexandrian forms and idioms as this. The *εἰπᾶν* is very frequent ; also in Matt 13: 48, *ἔβαλαν* ; Mark 8: 15, *ὅτι ἄρτους οὐκ εἶχαν* ; 12: 12, *ἀπῆλθαν* ; Luke 8: 34, *ἔφυγαν* ; Acts 2: 40, *διεμαρτύρατο* ; Acts 7: 27, 37, *εἶπας* for *εἰπῶν*, and v. 40, *εἰπαντες* ; Acts 7: 57, *σύνεσχαν τὰ ὅτια* ; 10: 23, *συνῆλθαν* ; 16: 7, *ἤθελαν*. The editor has pointed out in the Appendix, John 8: 22, *ἔλεγον* ; 8: 53, *ἀπέθαναν* ; Luke 1: 59, *ἦλθαν* ; he also mentions Luke 2: 16, *εὔραν*, which Wetstein pointed out. We observe besides, *λήμψονται* Matt. 20: 10 ; *λήμψεσθε*, Matt. 21: 22 ; *πιστεύετε ὅτι λήμψεσθε*, Mark 11: 24, Acts 1: 8, 2: 38 ; *λήμψονται*, Mark 12: 40 ; *συλλήμψη*, Luke 1: 31 ; *ἀνελήμφθη*, Mark 16: 19, Acts 1: 2, 22, 10: 16 ; *ἀναλημφθεῖς*, Acts 1: 11, &c. &c.

Now if, as the evidence shows, the MS. was written in Alexandria, we can determine its age with tolerable accuracy. It was written after the time of Euthalius and before the Arabian conquest, in the latter part of the fifth or in the sixth century, at the period when the Greeks abandoned the calligraphist's laborious means of gaining a subsistence and

<sup>1</sup> "Codex Theodori Bezae Cantabrigiensis, Evangelia et Apostolorum Acta complectens, quadratis literis Græco-Latinis, Academia auspicante, . . . edidit, codicis historiam præfixit, notasque adjecit Thomas Kipling, rel. Cantabrigiæ e prelo Academico impensis Academiae, MDCCXIII." in two splendid folio volumes.



surrendered the whole business into the hands of the poor and industrious Egyptians, who were not masters of the Greek and very little versed in the Latin. (Comp. § 49.)

It cannot well be denied that the MS. was intended for the use of Latins, and there are many traces of its having been in their possession. It is even the case that the Greek text from *μελλούσης ὀργῆς* in Matt. 3: 7 to *πνεῦμα τοῦ θεοῦ* in v. 16, from John 18: 14 to 20: 13, and from *πάσῃ τῇ κτίσει* in Mark 16: 15 to the end, which had been destroyed by time or accident, has been added by a Latin hand, probably about the twelfth century.

One of the passages supplied, viz. Matt. 2: 21—3: 8, which Kipling from the characters assigns to the 10th century, even serves to point out the country of the west in which the MS. was preserved. For it coincides perfectly with *Codex Corbeiensis*, which is printed in Bianchini's *Evangeliarium Quadruplex*;<sup>1</sup> and the latter MS. was preserved at Corbey, in France.

For the sake of those who entertain the idea that the Greek text was often corrupted from Latin MSS., we further observe, that they may be convinced of the contrary from the Cambridge Codex, and may be satisfied that the Latin has rather been accommodated to the Greek with childish scrupulosity and against all rules of grammar, sometimes even absurdly.

This Codex has no accents; but the circumstance is unimportant. Its predominant characteristic, its stichometrical arrangement, is decisive. Probably the copyist spared himself a piece of labor from which the Latins could derive but very little advantage. He had good reason for not subjoining at the end the Euthalian summaries of the *Stichoi*. They could not possibly suit this ancient text, which contained many words and clauses that no longer existed in the revised text copied by Euthalius.

The MS. which bears the mark *E* among those of the Acts of the Apostles, contains the Acts alone. In the Bodleian Library, to which it was presented by William Laud, Archbishop of Canterbury, it is designated *Laudianus III*. It wants some pages from Acts 25: 29 to 28: 6. It was printed at Oxford in 1715 by Thomas Hearne.

In this MS. the Greek text and one of the Latin versions before Jerome's time are written stichometrically opposite each other upon the same page, contrary to the custom in other MSS. The Latin comes first, then the Greek. The characters are uncial, square, large, somewhat heavy and much more rough than those of the Cambridge MS. The chapters of Euthalius are denoted by coarser initial letters extending into the margin. The copyist has omitted the accents and the enumeration of the *Stichoi* at the end.

It is the second known Græco-Latin MS. which is of Alexandrian origin. That it is so, is proved by the following readings; Acts 16: 20, 31, *εἶπαν*; 26: 15, *ἐγὼ δὲ εἶπα*; 22: 24, *εἶπας μάστιγι ἀντιτάς* . . . ; 2: 23, *ἀνείλατε*; 7: 10, *ἐξείλατο*; 21, *ἐνείλατο*; 5: 10, *ἡῦραν*; 8: 3, *ἐλυμήνατο*; 14: 15, *καὶ παραχοῆμα ἐξήλλατο*; 2: 40, 20: 23, *δι-*

<sup>1</sup> Præf. ad editionem Cod. Cantabr. p. XVIII.

εμαρτύροτο. According to Woide's testimony (*Præf. ad Cod. Alex.* § 76,) ἐλημψεν also stands for ἔληψεν.

We are thus led to the same conclusion as to the age of this MS. as we reached in the case of the Cambridge Codex. We cannot bring it lower down than the conquest of the Arabs, and must refer it to the 6th century or at any rate to the first quarter of the 7th.

In the interim between this period and the eighth century, it was in Sardinia. For at the end of the MS. there is subjoined a Greek edict of a *Dux Sardinia*, not in the hand writing of the copyists, βιβλιογράφων, but in the old documentary diplomatic hand beginning thus, Φλαυῖος Παγκράτιος σὺν θεῷ Δουξ Σαρδινίας δλῆα ποιῶ τὰ ὑπογεταγμένα. Επεὶ περ θεοστυγεῖς καὶ κρ. . . . Justinian, who restored the power of the Greeks in the west, was the first (as Wetstein observes, *L. I. Cod. Tit. 27. De off. Præf. Prætor. Africa leg. 2. § 3.*) who appointed *Duces Sardinia*, which he did in 534. But this authority of the eastern emperors lasted only till 749, when the Lombards subdued the island, and retained it till the fall of their power with their last King.<sup>1</sup> The cessation of the *Duces Sardinia* and of the Greek sway over the island in the middle of the 8th century, confirms the date assigned to the MS.; for the Greek statute of Φλαυῖος Παγκράτιος Δουξ Σαρδινίας must have been written in it during the dominion of the Greeks, i. e. before the middle of the 8th century. The edict, which it would appear related to a religious matter, must certainly contain some date or designation of time and probably might give us some information in regard to the Codex itself.

Woide has shown from several very satisfactory examples, that this Codex betrays no endeavour to accommodate the Greek to the Latin, but that, on the contrary, it forces and outrages the Latin in order to conform it entirely to the Greek. (*Præfat. ad ed. Cod. Alex. Sect. VI. § LXXX.*)

The MS. *D* of the Epistles of Paul has sometimes been considered as the second part of *D* of the Gospels and Acts. But its size is smaller, the parchment thinner and more beautiful, and the characters more elegant, than those of the Cambridge Codex. The abbreviations also, which they use, as Marsh has observed, are different, e. g. the abbreviations of Ἰησοῦς, Χριστός, etc.

This Codex is commonly called *Claramontanus*, and now bears the number 107 in the French Library; formerly it was 2245. The beginning of the Epistles to the Romans and the conclusion of that to the Hebrews (the first and last page,) are wanting, and in the middle, 1 Cor. 14: 13—22 has been supplied by a second hand. The MS. has many corrections from various hands, as is correctly stated by Griesbach.

The Greek as well as the Latin text is written in beautiful square uncial characters, in such a manner that the Greek is on one page on the left of the reader, and the Latin on the other upon his right. Both columns are disposed stichometrically. The Greek letters show that the librarius was a Latin. They are invariably furnished with accents where they were requisite.

Much as this latter circumstance perplexed Montfauçon, he dared

<sup>1</sup> Cambiagi, Istoria del regno di Sardegna. T. I. L. 3.

not absolutely deny the accents a like antiquity with the text. He therefore softens what he says by admitting that they must have been added to the MS. not long after it was written: "Accentus et spiritus annotantur, sed ii secundâ manu, ut videtur, nec diu, ut creditur, post descriptum codicem adjecti sunt." This is very possible, for, as has been observed, one calligraphist frequently wrote the MS. and another the accents. Griesbach admits that in particular passages of this MS., though extremely seldom, the accents were affixed by the first hand. (*Symb. Crit.* P. II. p. 32.) But this cannot be inferred with certainty from the faded or vivid appearance of the ink, as in many places the characters have been retouched with fresh ink. At any rate, even on this supposition the MS. originally had some accents, but they were not however applied throughout by the first copyist.

The chief characteristic of the book is that it is stichometrically written, and by this circumstance the limit of its antiquity is determined. It could not however be placed lower down than the 8th century, were we to judge merely from the Latin characters. But if we collate it with the Laudian MS. of the Acts, the origin of which cannot have been later than the first half of the 8th century, we must certainly attribute a higher antiquity to this Codex.

The copyist spared himself the trouble of subjoining at the end of each Epistle the Euthalian subscriptions and the number of the *stichoi*. Instead of this there is at the end of the Epistle to Philemon a list of the *stichoi* in all the books of the Old and New Testament; but by another hand, which likewise added the Epistle to the Hebrews. A specimen of this MS., taken from the Epistle to the Romans, is presented by Montfaucon, in his *Paleog. Gr.* (L. III. c. 4.)

*E* is a MS. of the Pauline Epistles which formerly belonged to the Abbey St. Germain at Paris, called *Codex Sangermanensis*. I have not been able to learn the number which it now bears, nor even whether it is now in existence.<sup>1</sup>

According to Wetstein it is merely a transcript of the *Codex Claromontanus*, and this is confirmed by Griesbach. The latter has even assigned its date accordingly. For he clearly distinguished several different correctors who had tried their talents in amending the Greek and Latin text of the *Cod. Claromont.* The alterations in the Latin made by one of these are even in the cursive character. Now all these corrections and particularly the latter, which are clearly of a very modern date, are exhibited in the text of the MS. of St. Germain. Accordingly the learned Griesbach assigned it to the 10th or 11th century. (*Symb. Crit.* P. II. p. 77 seq.) The uncial characters, moreover, it would seem from the specimens in Mabillon (*De re diplomat.* L. V. T. II. p. 346,) and Montfaucon (*Paleog. Gr.* L. III. c. 4. p. 218,) were not familiar to the copyist, for they rather resemble laborious painting than a fluent handwriting.

With this I reckon also two other MSS. which can claim no more right from their antiquity to be treated of here, than the MS. of St. Germain. Let me here however barely notice their origin and mutual re-

---

<sup>1</sup> I see from the public papers that the MS. is now in Petersburg, where it was carried by Counsellor Dubrowsky.

lation, in order to throw light upon what we shall say hereafter. As in Numismatics there are what are termed *nummi commatis barbarici*, re-impressions of Roman coins among barbarous nations, so we may call these MSS. *Codices barbari*. We allude to *F* and *G* of the Pauline Epistles. Both are in Greek and Latin, and transcripts of copies of which we have before treated.

*G* belonged, before it got into the Royal Library at Dresden, to Prof. Börner at Leipzig, and hence it is also called *Codex Boernerianus*. It contains only 13 Epistles of Paul: that to the Hebrews is not with the rest; and in the other Epistles the following passages are wanting—Rom. 1: 1—6. 2: 6—26. 8: 1, 2. 14: 23. 15: 1. 1 Cor. 3: 7—17. 6: 6—15. Coloss. 2: 1—9. Christian Fr. Matthæi had the whole MS. printed with all its peculiarities, together with an engraved fac-simile of the characters<sup>1</sup>.

The Greek characters are uncial, but formed in a peculiar way. They are very similar to those in the Psalter of Sedulius Scotus, to be seen in Montfauçon (*Paleog. Gr.* L. III. c. 7. p. 237), and also to those in a Psalter which I have seen in the library of the Seminary at Würzburg.

The text is from a stichometrical copy, although it is continuous, the *stichoi* not being separated. Instead of doing this, the copyist denoted the beginning of each of them by an initial letter. By writing separately the clauses which he has marked in this way, we shall have the stichometrical division. We will do this in regard to the engraved specimen, without altering the orthography in the least.

Ταυτα σοι γαρω  
 Ελπιζω ελθειν  
 Εαν βραδυνω  
 Ινα ιδης  
 Πως δει. εν οικω θεου αναστρεφεσθαι.  
 Ητις εστιν εκκλησια θεου ζωντος  
 Στυλος και εδραιωμα της αληθιας  
 Και ομολογουμενος.  
 Μεγα εστιν το της ευσεβιας. μυστηριον  
 Ος εμφανερωθη. εν σαρκι.  
 Εδικαιωθη εν πνευματι  
 Ωφθη αγγελοις.  
 Εκηρυχθη εν. εθνεσιν  
 Πιστευθη εν κοσμω  
 Ανελημφθη εν. δοξη  
 Ο δε πνευμα ρητως λεγει.  
 Οτι εν υστεροις καιροις————

<sup>1</sup> "XIII. Epistolarum Pauli Codex cum versione Latina veteri, vulgo Ante-Hieronymiana, olim Boernerianus nunc Bibliothecæ Electoralis Dresdensis, summa fide et diligentia transcriptus et editus a Chr. Fr. Matthæi. Misenæ impens. Erbenstienii MDCCCLXXXI." 4to.



To this correct stichometrical division by means of initial letters the copyist has also added marks of punctuation, thus evincing what an imperfect idea he had of a proper division, and his entire incapacity to adjust a few *Stichoi* according to the principles of Euthalius. He omitted the accents entirely.

The Latin version is one of those prior to the times of Jerome, and is inserted between the lines of the Greek. It is written in the smaller or cursive hand, and in Anglo-Saxon characters, such as Wetstein observed in a Psalter in the library at Basle, which, according to the subscription, originally came from Ireland.

The transcriber and his predecessors anxiously labored to make the version still more conformable to the Greek than it originally was; e. g. Rom. 4: 16, εἰς τὸ εἶναι βεβαίαν τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν, *in esse firmam promissionem*; 18, εἰς τὸ γενέσθαι αὐτὸν πατέρα πολλῶν ἐθνῶν, *in fiendo, aut ut fieret, eum pater, aut patrem*; 20, οὐ διεκρίθη τῇ ἀπιστίᾳ, ἀλλ' ἐνεδυναμώθη, *non haesitavit, aut aestimavit, aut dubitavit diffidentia, sed confortatus est, potentatus est*.

The MS. seems, also, to have been used in monastic schools for the study of Greek, whence certain notes which we find may be explained; as Rom. 8: 5, οἱ γὰρ κατὰ σὰρκα ὄντες, *qui secundum carnem sunt participium*; Rom. 4: 13, ἐπαγγελία τῇ Ἀβραάμ, *promissio dativus Abrahæ*, &c. But we cannot indulge any further in these observations, and must content ourselves with remarking how little ground there is for the theory of those who assume the corruption of the Greek MSS. from the Latin as a principle in the history of the text.

From what has been said, we perceive that the Boernerian Codex is a transcript of an older copy, the Greek text of which was written stichometrically in uncial characters, and at the side of which was an Ante-Jeromian version. Probably the original resembled the Clermont MS., and may have surpassed it in point of antiquity.

The copy from which this Codex was derived, was, like the Greek and Latin MSS. *D* and *E*, written in Alexandria, as is amply shown by the idioms which occur. Rom. 2: 11. Ephes. 6: 9. Col. 3: 25, προσωπολημψία. Philipp. 4: 15, δόσως καὶ λήμψεως. 1 Tim. 4: 3, μετ' ἀλημψις. Rom. 11: 15, πρόλημψις. 1 Cor. 12: 28, ἀντίλημψις. 1 Tim. 3: 2. 5: 7. 6: 14, ἀνεπίλημpton. Rom. 13: 2, λήμψονται. Galat. 6: 1, προλημψ-θη. 2 Thess. 2: 13, ὅτι εἴλατο ὑμᾶς. 2 Cor. 5: 17, γέγοναν. Rom. 15: 3, ἐπέπεσαν, 2 Cor. 6: 17, ἐξέλθατε.

The transcript was made in the tenth, or at the highest in the ninth century, since on its margin we find frequently noted by the first hand *contra Γοθδικάλκον, contra Græcos*. The former promulgated his tenets in the ninth century; and then, too, the latter fell out with the Latins and caused the famous schism.

Notes are also found in it in another language, which has no resemblance to the Anglo-Saxon, as e. g. at p. 22 in Matthæi's edition, which would probably most readily be explained by a native of Scotland or Ireland.

*F*, or *Augiensis*, is so called from the *Augia major* at Reichenau, the oldest Benedictine monastery in Germany, for St. Gallen belongs to Switzerland. The monastery is situated on a delightful island in the lower lake, a mile from Constance. Here was the first known abode

of this Codex, with numerous other very old MSS. After many adventures it reached England, and was supposed to be lost, till some years ago Dr. Herbert Marsh gave information of its present place of deposit. It is in the library of Trinity College, Cambridge. Wetstein collated it before it got over to England.

It is not interlinear like the former, but it is written in columns; first the Latin, then the Greek, on the same page. In the latter language it contains only thirteen Pauline Epistles; but in the Latin that to the Hebrews also. Some of its pages are lost from Rom. 3: 8 to the first to the Corinthians.

The Greek text is written in uncial characters, without accents; the Latin in the Anglo-Saxon cursive hand. Not only are the words in the Greek separated, but there is a point after each, and hence it must resemble the Psalter of Sedulius (with which Wetstein compares the characters of the MS.) much more than even the Boernerian MS. does.

We have yet to learn whether it exhibits any traces of *Stichoi*. The version in this MS. likewise is one of those which were current before Jerome's time.

Wetstein believed *G* to be a copy of *F*; there is nothing however to prevent our supposing the very reverse. In *F* there is a point after every word, and consequently each is separated from the rest and limited by this sign; while on the contrary *G* was copied from a MS. which had no separation of the words. This may be seen from the following examples; 1 Cor. 4: 21, the words are thus divided in *G*: πνεύματι τεπρα. σιητος. 1 Cor. 8: 7, ασθενης ους. αμολυνεται. 9: 12, ινα μη εν κοππητιν αδωμεν. 15: 33, q θειρουσιν η. θααρησ. τα ομιλια. Neither was the MS. *F* copied from *G*; for the method of writing in columns is the usual one in the oldest MSS., while we have no very ancient examples of the manner in which *G* is written. Moreover *G* has many peculiar readings which are not met with in *F*.

Yet it is remarkable how often they agree in their *minutiae* and mistakes; so often indeed that it is difficult to deny their close mutual relation. These apparently inconsistent circumstances can be explained only by supposing that both had a common origin from a MS. which, according to the custom of the period, had received different corrections, of which one of the copyists adopted this and the other that for insertion in his text.

The MS. of Reichenau is about as old as the Boernerian; for the words, "post illam generalem baptismi gratiam etc." which were taken, as Semler has observed, from Rhabanus Maurus and appended to the Reichenau Codex, are by the first hand. Hence it cannot have been written earlier than in the last half of the ninth or during the tenth century.

These MSS. did not stray into our country, but probably originated here. In the seventh century there came among us numerous emigrants from Ireland, as well as some from Scotland, who settled here, and were the fathers and founders of our monastic institutions and abbeys. Among these were Gallus, Columban, Fridolin, Trudpert, Pirmin, and others, who eventually drew pupils after them from their native land. Hence we sometimes see in our monastic libraries MSS. in the Anglo-Saxon characters. These pupils probably brought with them some

knowledge of the Greek language; and in this way we obtained Graeco-Anglo-Saxon MSS. For, towards the end of the seventh century, Theodore, a Greek by birth, was educated at Athens, admitted into the priesthood in Italy, and afterwards despatched by the Holy See with the archiepiscopal dignity to Britain.<sup>1</sup> Through his means a knowledge of the Greek language was introduced into the British monasteries.

*Codex H.* was a very beautiful stichometrical MS., fragments of which were preserved in the celebrated library of Bishop Coislin at Metz, No 202. These fragments of the Pauline Epistles have been printed by Montfauçon, and carefully examined *de novo* by Griesbach.<sup>2</sup> A catalogue of them may be found in his small edition of the New Testament, and a specimen of the characters in Montfauçon.

In earlier times this Codex was on Mount Athos, where it was used for old parchment to cover other books in the year 1208, as appears from a note in the book which it was used to cover.

It is written in Greek alone, in very large genuine square characters of the ancient form, is stichometrical (as before said), and furnished with the accents. It had also the Euthalian subscriptions, of which the one at the end of the Epistle to Titus still exists: *ἐπιστολὴ πρὸς Τίτον τῆς Κρητῶν ἐκκλησίας κ. τ. λ.*

Montfauçon inferred from the note: *ἀντιβλήθη ἡ βίβλος πρὸς τὸ ἐν Καισαρείᾳ ἀντίγραφον τῆς βιβλιοθήκης τοῦ ἁγίου Παμφίλου χειρὶ γεγραμμένον*, which is found at the end of the MS., that it was written in Syria. But this postscript belongs to Euthalius and not to the copyist. On the other hand, the form *ἐνκατάλημπτον*, in the fourth and fifth lines of the subscription, is Alexandrian. Hence the MS., considering its genuine ancient characters, must have been written in the 6th century, before the irruption of the Arabs. (Comp. § 49.)

## § 52.

We pass now to the MSS. which were written subsequently to stichometry, and among them we give the first place to *Codex K*, which was brought from Cyprus in the year 1637, and is hence called *Cyprius*. It was once *Colbertin*. 5149, and is now N. 63 in the library of the King of France.<sup>3</sup> We have assigned it the first place because it informs us clearly how the change from stichometry to proper punctuation occurred. (Comp. § 45.) It is not indeed of the same date with this occurrence. Stichometry was abandoned before the existence of this Codex.

<sup>1</sup> Epist. Zachariae ad Bonifac. (in Hartzheim's *Concilia Germ.* T. I. p. 84.) "In gentem Anglorum et Saxonum in Britannia insula primi praedicatores ab sede apostolica missi, Augustinus, Laurentius, Justus, et Honorius, novissime et tuis temporibus Theodorus Graeco-Latinus, ante philosophus et Athenis eruditus, Romae ordinatus, pallio sublimatus ad praefatam Britanniam transmissus judicabat et gubernabat."

<sup>2</sup> Montfauç. *Biblioth. Coislin.* Part II. p. 253-263. Griesbach. *Symbol. Crit.* P. II. p. 85.

<sup>3</sup> Scholz has fully described it and collated it *de novo*. "Comment. inaugur. de Cod. Cyprio et familia quam sistit." Ed. Jo. Mart. August. Scholz, at the end of his "Curae criticae in historiam textus evangeliarum." 4to Heidelberg. 1820.

But it is a transcript of a copy of that period, and contains the four Gospels in uncial characters, which are rather narrow, furnished with accents which, however, are negligently placed and are wanting over many words and even over whole lines—a constant subject of regret in biblical MSS.

The punctuation-marks in which it abounds, have this peculiarity, that they are inserted without regard to grammatical division. A dot is always used to denote the end of a *Stichos*, in order to save the blank space which was lost by the usual separation of the *Stichoi*. There is a specimen of the characters in Montfauçon, (*Paleog. Gr. L. III. § 6. p. 232.*) and another in Scholz's treatise. The subscription, which might determine something in regard to the age of the MS., is very much injured. Montfauçon, and with him Scholz, assign the Codex to the eighth century. But no one has yet shown that the compressed letters  $\text{C} \in \text{O} \ominus$  were ever used in MSS. of so early a date as the eighth century; or that the letters *Z* and *Ξ* ever have their strokes prolonged beneath the line, or that the small strokes at the bottom of the letter *Δ* are ever extended below the line, in such MSS. I cannot therefore give up my opinion that it is not older than the ninth century.

*E* of the Gospels in the library at Basle (*B. VI. 21.*), wants Luke 3: 4—15, 24: 47 to the end.—The following passages have been added by a second hand: Luke 1: 69—2: 4, 12: 58—13: 12, and 15: 8—20.

With the exception of the appendages to the text, it is written in a beautiful upright uncial character of the more ancient kind. The letters  $\text{C} \in \text{O} \ominus$  are perfectly round, the strokes of *X*, *Z*, *Ξ*, are not prolonged below the line, as may be seen in regard to most of these letters in the specimen we have given. (*See engraving.*) A regular system of punctuation is employed through the whole book. The full stop is denoted by a dot at the top of the letter; the middle pause by one about the middle of the letter; and the smallest by a dot at the bottom of the line, which is sometimes lengthened into a manifest comma. The words are generally furnished with accents, but they were now and then forgotten. The text is divided, like that of *Codd. A, C*, into sections resembling verses.

But in the appendages to the text we find characters belonging to other periods. An uncial character of the ninth century predominates, not unlike the characters found in *Cod. L*, with all the compressed and lengthened letters which are found in MSS. of this century. In this character are written the summaries of the chapters or the *τίτλοι*, which are prefixed to the Gospels, the pages containing which summaries, it is evident, were separately inserted and stitched with the rest. By the same or a contemporary hand are the designations of the Ammonian sections on the side of the page, as also on the lower margin the references to other Evangelists in which any particular narrative likewise occurs, together with the notices of the festivals on which certain portions were read: e. g. at the beginning of Matthew—*εἰς τὰ ἅγια θεοφάνια, ἡ μετὰ φῶτα, μετὰ τὰ φῶτα, μετὰ τὴν ἡ ἁγίων πάντων*, etc.

Both kinds of characters sometimes occur on the same line or immediately beneath each other. The festivals are very seldom designated in the ancient character; but certain *formulae* at the beginning of



church-lessons are found marked very frequently in this hand upon the upper margin; e. g. on the 70th page: τῷ καιρῷ ἐκείνῳ ἐλάλησεν ὁ Ἰς; 96th, εἰσηλθεν ὁ Ἰς εἰς Καπερναοῦμ; p. 100. τῷ καιρῷ ἐκείνῳ ἐπορεύετο ὁ Ἰς τοῖς σάββασιν. etc. These introductory *formulae* are often inserted far into the page, so that a blank space remained before them, which was occupied by the writer of the second species of character. Thus, p. 110, the introduction: τῷ καιρῷ ἐκείνῳ ἤκουσεν ὁ Ἡρώδης ὁ βασιλεὺς τὴν ἀκοὴν τοῦ Ἰου, is in the first hand; the words which are prefixed: εἰς τὴν ἀποτομὴν τοῦ προδοῦ, are in the second character; and in p. 158 the formula, τῷ καιρῷ ἐκείνῳ ἦλθεν, is in the more ancient, and the τίτλος—περὶ τοῦ ἔχοντος πνεῦμα δαιμονίου, in the latter character.

Now if a distinction is not carefully made, we shall pass a wrong judgment and do injustice to the body of the MS., which is of far greater antiquity than these appendages to the text. A MS. which received additions of this nature in the ninth century, must the rather on this account be regarded as of earlier date than the ninth century; and its characters bear infallible marks of a more ancient date. Let it not be objected that perhaps the calligraphist took it into his head to imitate a more ancient character. There is no appearance of a mere imitation. Every letter is boldly traced; every stroke is made by a fearless hand. It is the writing of a ready penman, not of a timid imitator. I am acquainted with a MS. of the four Gospels of the nature alleged, which was formerly in the possession of Chevalier Nani, and is now through his generosity in St. Mark's Library. It is clearly evident that it was written about the tenth century; yet the letters C O E Θ in it are as round as in the oldest MSS. But the hesitating, uncertain hand which guided the reed or pen betrays itself most plainly. We see the unsteadiness of the hair strokes, the mode in which the heavy strokes were gradually made thicker by repeated touching, etc. etc. Nothing of this kind can be discovered in the Basle Codex. The characters in which it is written are the genuine ones of the eighth century. But I will not venture to assign to it a higher antiquity, for this reason, viz. that while in the more ancient writing, if a calligraphist was pressed for room at the end of a line, he made the letters every way smaller; this Codex only compressed the letters in width, making them narrower. This is most striking in C E O, and may be regarded as a prelude to the alterations of the ninth century.

The fac-simile which I insert in this edition was taken by Prof. Hess of Basle, who undertook the trouble with extreme politeness. I was desirous of presenting a passage which should afford likewise a specimen of the second species of character. This is presented in the plate, (which contains Luke 8: 13-18,) at the end of the 15th verse. The abbreviation πρθ denotes the addition, or παράθεσις, which the public reader made as a concluding formula: ταῦτα λέγων ἐφάνει ὁ ἔχ—i. e. ἔχων ὧτα ἀκούειν, ἀκούετω. The abbreviation Cās, σαββάτω s. refers to the cross after οὐδεὶς, v. 16, by which the beginning of a reading section is denoted. By the side of σαββάτω s. a third hand, which however appears far more rarely than the second, has added the introductory formula: εἶπεν ὁ κύριος οὐδεὶς. . . which the other writer had omitted.

This MS. was for a long time in Constantinople or its vicinity. Not to be prolix, I will mention but two of the evidences of this. The feast τῶν ἁγίων ἀναργύρων is marked in Matthew. These moneyless saints were Cosmas and Damian, who practised medicine *gratuitously*.<sup>1</sup> As early as the last half of the sixth century they had a temple at Constantinople through the favour of Justin the Second and Sophia his wife.<sup>2</sup> We find the following words in the margin of Luke: εἰς τὴν μνήμην τῶν ἁγίων νοταρίων. These were exclusively Constantinopolitan saints, who perished in the tumult excited by Macedonius, and were afterwards esteemed martyrs. A church was built over their graves, which was standing in the days of Sozomen.<sup>3</sup>

This Codex, then, was used in Constantinople or its vicinity as a church-MS., on which account it contains designations of the church-lessons by the original hand. Hence the τίτλοι could easily be dispensed with, as well as the Ammonian sections also, and it was another hand which enriched the MS. with them and with designations of all the sacred festivals.

If we are right in assigning the origin of this MS. to the eighth century, it cannot be denied, that a perfect system of punctuation was prevalent in this century, at least in some countries.

L, once 2861, now 62 at Paris in the royal library, contains the four Gospels on parchment, elegantly written with uncial letters in two columns; yet not with what is called the old square character. C, E, O, Θ are compressed; Z, Ξ, X, are prolonged beneath the line; the small strokes of A and the cross stroke of Θ are exactly as in the specimen presented, which I copied with care, and which I hope will be prepared with care for this edition by the artist. The Codex has accents, which however are negligently placed and often entirely wanting. The punctuation is expressed by two marks; the greater and middle pause by a cross and the smallest by a comma.

Wetstein collated the MS., and after him with peculiar care Griesbach, who has given a description of it.<sup>4</sup> It bears infallible marks of the country of its origin. Griesbach observes respecting the orthography of the MS.: "Semper scribitur λήμψομαι cum conjugatis pro λήψομαι, et saepissime εἶπαν pro εἶπον, nonnunquam etiam ἦλθαν et ἴδαν." We also find ἴδαν for εἶδον in Luke 9: 32 and 10: 24; for ἐξεληλύθατε in Luke 7: 24, 22: 52, ἐξήλθατε; also for εἶδον and εὔρομεν in Luke 2: 16 and 23: 2, εὔρα, εὔραμεν; and for ἐωράκασιν in Luke 9: 26, ἐώρακαν. Hence it is of Egyptian origin, and from the characters it appears that it is an Egyptian MS. of the second period. (§ 49.) Griesbach has assigned it to the ninth century, in which I perfectly agree with him.

V, a MS. of the four Gospels, belongs to the library of the Holy Syn-

<sup>1</sup> Suicer, Thes. Philol. V. ἀναργύρος. Balsam. Schol. ad Photii Nomoc. Tit. VII. c. 1. in Biblioth. Juris Canon. Voell. et Justell. T. I. p. 230.

<sup>2</sup> Anonym. apud Bandur. in Antiq. Imp. Orient. P. II. T. I. p. 30. comp. notes on this passage, T. II. p. 624-5.

<sup>3</sup> Sozom. H. E. L. IV. c. 3. Comp. the Notes of Valesius on this passage and on Socrates, H. E. L. V. c. 22.

<sup>4</sup> Griesbach, Symb. Crit. Tom. I. p. LXVI—LXXIX.

od at Moscow, where this Codex is regarded as the oldest monument among the literary treasures there preserved. It wants Matt. 5: 44—6: 12. 9: 18—10: 1. 22: 44—23: 35. Mark and Luke are perfect, but at John 7: 39 begins a new hand, which continues to the end, and in which a subscription also is added. But this has so little bearing upon a decision of the age of the MSS., that Matthæi wholly rejects it as inadmissible for this purpose.

The writing is uncial, or, if that word be disliked, the letters are those of the larger alphabet, which, however, are very small and neat. They are not much larger than those of Cardinal Barberini's Hexaplar MS. of the Prophets; they are, however, somewhat longer. (*Bianchini Evang. Quadr. P. I. ad pag. DXXXII. Cod. Barb. Sign. num. V.*) The MS., as is shown by the specimen which Matthæi has published with the Apocalypse, is not written *συνεχῶς* at all, but *serie continuâ*. It is divided, however, into small paragraphs resembling verses. The beginning of Mark has been engraved as a specimen of the character.

The MS. has, besides the accents, a regular punctuation throughout. For a full stop a dot is placed at the top of a letter: for the middle pause one at the bottom; and for the smallest a comma. The form and elegance of the characters assign that part of the MS. which precedes John 7: 39 to the ninth century. The rest is several centuries younger. The MS., as I am assured on good authority, was preserved with other MSS. from the conflagration of Moscow. Matthæi has described it in his Appendix *Ad Thessalonicens.* p. 265 seq.

*g*, (XCVIII. in the library of the Holy Synod,) which was formerly in the monastery of St. Dionysius on Mount Athos, contains all the Pauline and Catholic Epistles. The Catholic Epistles are accompanied with a Catena; the Pauline with Scholia by John Damascenus. The text is written in two columns in uncial characters, with accents and marks of punctuation. A dot above the letter denotes the full stop; in the middle, the middle pause; and beneath, the smallest or the comma.

The Catena and Scholia are written in the cursive hand, on which account the MS. can hardly have been written before the tenth century. There is a description of it in Matthæi at the end of *Epist. ad Rom. Tit. et Philem.* p. 265—67, together with a specimen of it taken from the Catholic Epistles.

*b* is an *Evangelistarium* (in the library of the Holy Synod, N. XLII.) in two columns, with uncial characters and accents, and, judging from the specimen which has been presented, is badly punctuated and full of mistakes. The characters are rather heavy, yet not ill-formed. They very much resemble those of another *Evangelistarium* of the year 995, in Wetstein N. 5, of which Montfaucon has given a specimen in the *Append. ad Paleogr.* He calls its possessor Corel; it should have been Covel. A description of the Moscow MS. may be found in Matthæi, *Epist. ad Thessalonic.* p. 252. where likewise a specimen of the characters is presented.

*h* is an *Evangelistarium* (N. XII. in the library of the Holy Synod,) the beginning of which, comprising some lessons in John, is much injured. It is written in two columns, in long uncial characters, with accents and punctuation-marks. The smallest division is made, as appears from the specimen, by a dot which is lengthened almost to a line;



the full stop is denoted by a cross. The MS. is in general exceedingly correct, and was written by a very competent copyist. The characters bear much resemblance to those of an *Evangeliarium* (*Colbert. 700. Wetsten. n. 1.*) of which a page is to be found in Montfauçon (*Paleogr. L. III. C. 4. p. 229.*) Montfauçon is inclined to assign it to the 8th century. We might agree with him if he had only proved that there existed a regular system of punctuation at that period; but without valid proof of so important a point, the 9th century is full early enough for a MS. possessing the characteristics which we find in this. Matthæi has described it (*Ad Thessalonic. p. 253. 4.*) and furnished a specimen.

*M.*, once the property of the Abbé des Camps, now n. 48. in the Library of France, contains the four Gospels in the uncial character with accents and punctuation marks. The MS. has moreover other marks above the lines in red ink, which are apparently notes according to which the Gospels were chanted in the churches. It has, besides, certain difficult characters and likewise various readings on the margin in the cursive hand; to all appearance they are by the original penman. From this characteristic it cannot be older than the 10th century. There is a specimen in Montfauçon. (*Paleogr. L. III. c. 8. p. 260.*)

### § 53.

We have yet to notice briefly some, at least, of the remarkable MSS. in the cursive character to which we have referred in the history of the text.

We will mention those of the Gospels first.

*No. 1* of the Gospels in Wetstein and Griesbach, has the mark *B. VI. 27.* in the Library at Basle, and is an elegant MS., adorned with pictures. It contains the whole New Testament, (except the Apocalypse,) which however is so arranged that the Acts and Epistles come first and the Gospels follow. Before the Gospel of John is depicted the resurrection of Lazarus. By the side of Jesus stand two male figures, crowned and clad in purple and gold, one old and grey-bearded, the other youthful. Beneath the picture is a Greek epigram, from which we learn that one of the Leos is represented in it, and Wetstein has shown from other considerations that the two crowned persons are Leo the Wise and his son Constantine Porphyrogenitus, under whom this MS. was probably written for the use of the church of St. Lazarus which was built by Leo. Leo lived at the end of the 9th and in the beginning of the 10th century. The text of the Gospels is very different from the text of the rest of the MS.

*No. 10* in the edition of Prof. Matthæi comes next; in Griesbach it is marked *M<sup>t</sup>. 10.* This MS. is in the library of Nicephorus, Archbishop of Chersonesus, and contains the four Gospels accompanied with Scholia. According to the subscription at the end of Luke's Gospel, it was presented by the copyist Moses, the son of Elias, to the monastery of the votaries of St. Michael at Jerusalem. This circumstance confirms what we asserted respecting the text of this MS., viz. that it was transcribed from a copy of the Palestinian Recension.

It is written on parchment in the cursive hand, in folio, with accents and punctuation marks. The initial letters, the summaries of the con-



tents of the Gospels, the inscriptions of the same, the Eusebian Canons and the designations of the large chapters are in the margin in red ink and ornamented with gold. The whole MS. is in an excellent state of preservation, correct, and, it would appear, even splendid. To say the least, it must have been written before the crusades, before the close of the 11th century. We could not expect to find a MS. written at Jerusalem, during or after those expeditions. Matthæi has described it at the end of *Epp. ad Thessalonic.* p. 234—7. and presented a specimen taken from Luke.

No. 114 according to Griesbach, or *Harlei.* 5540, contains the Gospels on parchment, written in a small elegant hand sometime in the 13th century. It has been carefully collated only in Matt. VIII, IX, X, XI; elsewhere with invariable negligence. In this MS. are wanting Matt. XVII. 4—18. and XXVI. 57—73. (*Griesbach, Symb. Crit.* P. I. CLXXXIII.)

No. 124 according to Griesbach, in the Royal Library at Vienna *Lambec.* XXXI. 4. At the end of each Gospel the *στίχοι* and *ῥήματα* are marked together. The cursive hand is not elegant; the initial letters are rude. A description of it and an engraved specimen, together with excellent observations on the text of this MS., have been furnished us by Treschow in his *Tentam. Descriptionis Codicum Vet. Græc. Nov. Foed. qui in biblioth. C. Vindob. asservantur. Hauniae.* 1773. § 4. Birch, who likewise collated the MS., assigns it to the 11th or 12th century. (*Proleg. in edit. IV. Evang.* p. LVIII.)

1 is a MS. in Matthæi, notices of which are scattered here and there in his edition. (See the end of his edition of *Epp. ad Thessalon.* p. 187. *Praefat. in Acta App.* p. X. *Praefat. in Epp. Cath.* p. XXV.) The specimen is from *Epist. ad Rom.* It contains the whole New Testament and the Psalter, together with the Canticles (so called,) in an extremely small cursive hand, with accents, punctuation-marks and portraits of the Evangelists and Apostles. The text of the Acts, (and it is on this account principally that it is here noticed,) is of an entirely different Recension from the rest of the book. The MS. is numbered CCCLXXX, in the Library of the Holy Synod, and, in the estimation of the learned man who collated it, belongs to the 12th century.

*Vatic.* 367 contains the Acts, Catholic and Pauline Epistles in 4to.; it was written about the 12th century. (*Birch. Variæ Lectiones ad Text. Act. App. Epp. Cath. et Pauli. Hauniae.* 1798. *Prolegom.* p. IX.) The MS. has a pure text in the Acts and Catholic Epistles; but in the Pauline Ep. it is much disfigured by readings from other MSS.

No. 17 in Wetstein and Griesbach, containing the Epistles of Paul, was formerly *Colbert.* 2844, and is now N. 14 in the Library at Paris. The MS. contains extracts from the Prophets, with the whole New Testament, the Apocalypse excepted. The leaves are bound together; it begins with the first Epistle to the Corinthians, and proceeds in order as far as Philemon inclusive. The Epistle to the Hebrews comes before the two to Timothy. After Philemon comes the Acts and then the Epistle to the Romans; then the Catholic Epistles and lastly the Gospels. It is well written and belongs to the 10th or 11th century. The epistles of Paul are especially worthy of our notice. In the Gospels it is numbered in Wetstein 33, and 13 in the Acts and Catholic

Epistles. (*Griesbach, Symb. Crit. T. I. p. 167 seq.* There are observations on its text of the Pauline Epistles in *Griesbach's Symb. Crit. T. 2. p. 87—148.* Begtrup made a gleanings of various readings which was published by Birch in his *Supplem. to Var. Lectiones ad Text. Apoc. Hauniæ, 1800. p. 95. seq.*

The Vatican MS. 579 contains the Apocalypse along with various other writings; it is on cotton paper, and perhaps belongs to the 13th century. Hence it is not very ancient; but it was derived from a pure copy in an excellent state of preservation. The copyist, however, had already made preparations to corrupt the text; for he has collected various readings from another MS. and noted them in the margin. They would probably have been introduced into the next transcript as emendations: it is even probable that he had already done this himself in respect to some passages, unless indeed it were done before him; for the MS. even now sometimes deviates from its family. (*Birch. Var. Lectiones ad Text. Apoc. p. 9, 12.*)

## CHAPTER VII.

### EDITIONS OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.

#### § 54.

A beautiful invention released the copyists from their laborious occupation; and who would not imagine that it must very soon have been applied to the documents of Christianity? But in truth their turn came very late; many works of the classic authors of Greece having been multiplied by means of the press and disseminated in Europe before any one ventured to publish the books of the New Testament in the original language, although there already existed several impressions of the Latin and also of the German Bible.

Did this result from the veneration entertained for these books? From the distrust of capacity for such a task which was felt by every one? Or was it because that after the Florentine Council little reliance was placed on the Greeks or on their MSS.? It could hardly be for want of religious liberty, as the Councils of Constance and Basle had recently taken it under their protection against the alarming pretensions set up on the other side of the Alps.

At least it was not so in one free state, which was never inclined to endure coercion from without. I allude to Venice, where the celebrated Aldus in the year 1504 first edited, not a New Testament, but only the first six chapters of John's Gospel, as an experiment,<sup>1</sup> and, contrary to what we should have expected, no advance was made beyond this for

<sup>1</sup> Adler in the *Repert. für bibl. und morgenl. Litteratur, XVIII. Th. p. 150. seq.*

a long time. Before this there probably existed nothing of the New Testament but Mary's song of praise, Luke 1: 42—56, and Zachariah's, Luke 1: 68—80, which are attached to a beautiful Greek Psalter, of the year 1486, in my own possession.

### § 55.

Now, however, two individuals at the same time undertook the neglected task, one of whom possessed surpassing learning and critical acumen, and the other surpassing zeal and perseverance; moreover, neither were wanting in the spirit or the means of liberal expenditure. These were Desiderius Erasmus, and the Spanish Minister, Cardinal Ximenes.

In the midst of the festivities with which the Court celebrated the birth of an heir to the throne, (1502,) the Minister projected his Polyglot Bible, (*Biblia Complutensia*, the Bible of Alcalá,) called together the learned men to whom he desired to entrust its execution, and afterwards labored with them himself in the midst of the most weighty affairs of state.<sup>1</sup>

It seems that they began with the New Testament, for according to the postscript at the end of the Apocalypse, that book was completed in January, 1514, while the whole was not finished till the 10th of July, 1517.

In preparing this edition, as they state in the preface, they made use of the oldest and most correct MSS., which were sent them by Leo X from the papal Library. As Leo was elevated to the papal chair in March 1513, it is impossible, even leaving out of the account the time necessary for the transmission of the MSS., that they could have made much use of them in the ten months that elapsed before the completion of the Apocalypse in January 1514. It must have been the case then, that they received these MSS. earlier, in the time of Julius II, through the intervention of the Cardinal de Medici, who had great influence over this Pope and afterwards received their thanks for his good offices, when he was in possession of that dignity in which he succeeded Julius.

They had also other MSS. which they have not expressly mentioned. At least Stunica, in his controversy with Erasmus, often refers to a *Codex Rhodiensis*, which was probably sold to the rocket-makers with other MSS. of the University Library at Alcalá.<sup>2</sup>

Ximenes had the satisfaction of seeing his work completed; but he died four months afterwards, on the 8th November 1517, before it was published. Several years elapsed after his decease before Leo X granted permission for its publication, which he did on the 20th of March, 1521.

Erasmus began later, but his edition of the New Testament was published before that of Alcalá. It was accompanied with a Latin version

<sup>1</sup> Hist. du Card. Ximenes par Flechier, T. I. L. I. l'an 1502. Hist. du Ministère du Card. Ximenes par Marsolier. T. II. L. IV.

<sup>2</sup> Michaelis' Einleit. in das N. Test. I. Th. § 106 p. 776. 4th ed.

of his own by the side of the Greek, together with valuable notes, and appeared in folio in the year 1516. It was published by Frobenius.

The basis of his edition was, as to the Gospels, *Codex Basil. B. VI.* 25; and as to the Acts and Epistles *Codex Basil. IX*, both which, with corrections from Erasmus' own hand, are preserved in the City Library of Basle. *Codex Reuchlini*, from which he drew his text of the Apocalypse, is no longer to be found. With these he sometimes collated *Basil. VI.* 17, and *Basil. B. X.* 20; as also some Latin MSS., as he says in the preface to his Annotations, p. 225, and some of the fathers: "Postremo ad probatissimorum omnium suffragiis autorum, vel citationem, vel emendationem, vel enarrationem, nempe Origenis, Chrysostomi, Cyrilli, Hieronymi, Ambrosii, Hilarii, Augustini, quorum testimonia complusculis locis in hoc adduximus."

The annotations, it seems, were made during the revision of the text; hence the preface which precedes them is dated 1515, before the printing of the whole was completed.

This edition was speedily followed by this remarkable man with a second in 1519, and a third in 1522. It was in the latter that he first adopted the passage 1 John 5: 7, as he says, *e codice Britannico*.<sup>1</sup> Afterwards a fourth and fifth appeared in 1527 and 1535. In the two last he made use of the Alcalá Bible, adopting several emendations from it, particularly in the Apocalypse.

### § 56.

A beginning had now been made, and several other individuals soon appeared in the field. Among these was Andrew Asulanus, the father-in-law of Aldus, who, in 1518, reprinted the Erasmian text in folio at Venice, but not without collating other MSS., even though what he says in his preface, "multis vetustissimis exemplaribus collatis," be an exaggeration. At least we find traces of such a collation in certain variations, particularly in the Apocalypse; and one of the MSS. which he used, containing the whole New Testament except the Apocalypse, has been identified.<sup>2</sup>

As he adopted Erasmus for his guide, Robert Stephens, in his neat edition of 1546 in 16mo., followed the Bible of Alcalá. This is called the *mirificam* edition in allusion to the commencement of the preface: "O mirificam regis nostri . . . liberalitatem." The occasion of this denomination was, the supposition that it was entirely free from *errata*. In preparing this edition several MSS. were likewise at his command, concerning which he expresses himself with true French vivacity: "Si-

<sup>1</sup> This is well known to have been *Cod. Montfortii*, written about the 14th century. Comp. *Opp. Erasmi*, Tom. IX. p. 294. 595. Bas. 1540, and *Repertor. fur bibl. und morgenl. Litt.* III. Th. p. 260. Dr. Herbert Marsh collated the passage in *Cod. Montf.*: ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ, πατήρ, λόγος, καὶ πνεῦμα ἅγιον, καὶ αὐτοὶ οἱ τρεῖς ἐν εἰσι. Καὶ τρεῖς εἰσι οἱ μαρτυροῦντες ἐν τῇ γῇ, with the Complut. ed. in which it runs thus: ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ. ὁ πατὴρ, καὶ ὁ λόγος καὶ τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα, καὶ οἱ τρεῖς εἰς τὸ ἐν εἰσι. Καὶ τρεῖς εἰσιν οἱ μαρτυροῦντες ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς. (Notes and additions to Michaelis' Introduction, p. 337. 338. See also Paulus' Memorabilia, chap. VI. p. 14. 31.)

<sup>2</sup> Birch, Præf. in IV. Evang. Hauniæ. 1788. p. VII. VIII. It is the *Vatic.* 360.



quidem codices nacti aliquot ipsa vetustatis specie pene adorandos, quorum copiam nobis bibliotheca regia facile suppeditavit;" he then adds: "adjuti præterea sumus cum aliis, tum vero Complutensi editione, quam ad vetustissimos bibliothecæ Leonis X. Pont. codices excudi jusserat Hispaniarum Cardinalis Franciscus Simenius, *quos cum nostris miro consensu sæpissime convenire ex ipsa collationeprehendimus.*"

This agreement between his MSS. and the edition of Alcalá must certainly have been very great, for it appears from comparison that not only in this, but also in the next edition in 16mo. 1549, he has exactly copied it except in a few places. (Bengel, *Introd. in Cr. Nov. Test.* § 36. p. 435.)

In the third edition, however, which was printed in folio in 1550, with great typographical elegance, and is his principal edition, he follows (Bengel. *l. c.*) the fifth edition of Erasmus, with which he collated 16 MSS., noting their various readings in the margin. "Cum vetustissimis sedecim scriptis exemplaribus," says he in the Preface: the first however was, as he says himself, the Complutensian copy; the second was from Italy, the 3d, 4th, 5th, 6th, 7th, 8th, 10th and 15th were from the Royal library; the rest, which he cites in the margin under the marks  $\alpha, \beta, \gamma$ , up to  $\iota$ s, from other places.<sup>1</sup> In the year 1551, an edition

<sup>1</sup> The learned have taken great pains to discover the MSS. which Stephens used in his third edition. This solicitude has been occasioned by 1 John 5: 7, where Stephens put a sign of omission before  $\epsilon\nu\ \tau\tilde{\omega}\ \omicron\tilde{\upsilon}\rho\alpha\nu\tilde{\omega}$ , without denoting that it extended to the following words as far as  $\epsilon\nu\ \tau\tilde{\eta}\ \gamma\tilde{\eta}$ . He placed in the margin " $\delta. \epsilon. \zeta. \iota. \alpha. \iota\gamma.$ " meaning that these MSS. omitted the part marked; and it was hence concluded that they did not want the whole passage, but only the words,  $\epsilon\nu\ \tau\tilde{\omega}\ \omicron\tilde{\upsilon}\rho\alpha\nu\tilde{\omega}$ , or that if they omitted the whole passage, the ten others at least contained it. (David Martin, *Vérité du texte 1 Jean 5: 7, démontrée par des preuves, qui sont au-dessus de toute exception.* Utrecht. 1722, 8vo. *Journal des Savans.* Juin. 1720. p. 643.)

Le Long and Wetstein commenced a search after these MSS. and found a part of them. Griesbach corrected their statements, and Fleischer in his letters to Michaelis, from which the latter has given extracts in the 3d and 4th edition of his Introduction, names the numbers which they subsequently received in the royal library at Paris.

$\alpha$ , according to the account of Robert Stephens himself, is the *Edit. Complut.*— $\beta$ , is *Cantabr. Ev. D.*— $\gamma$ , *Evang. Reg.* 2867, now, according to Fleischer, 84. Griesbach (*Proleg. in Nov. Testament. Edit. 2dam Sect. I. p. 19.*) doubts the correctness of the assertion; he and Wetstein cite it under the designation *N. 4. Evang.*— $\delta$ , *Reg.* 2871, Fleischer 106, contains the whole New Testament except the Apocalypse; in Griesbach and Wetstein it is designated *n. 5.* in all the classes— $\epsilon$ , *Reg.* 3425, Fleischer 112, the whole New Testament excepting the Apoc.; in Wetstein and Griesbach always *n. 6.*— $\zeta$ , *Reg.* 2866, Fleischer 71, Gospels; in Wetstein and Griesbach *n. 7.*— $\eta$ , a Codex, for which Wetstein cites two MSS., *Reg.* 2242 Gospels, and 2241 Paul, Acts and Cath. Epistles. The Gospels and Paul are numbered 8 in Wetstein; the Acts and Cath. Epistles 50. But 2241 contains, according to Fleischer, not only the Acts, Paul and the Cath. Epistles, but the whole New Testament, and is now *n. 47.* but to appearance once had the number 2242, probably by mistake. There existed however in the Royal Library a MS. of the Gospels with the *N. 2242*, now 49. Now 2241, at present *N. 47.* was not in the Royal Library till long after Stephens' time, till the year 1687; hence Griesbach conjectures that 2242, *n. 49.* might once have contained the Acts and Cath. Epistles, which however have been misplaced. (*Proleg. in Nov. Testament. Ed. 2. Sect. I. p. 21.*)— $\iota$ , is certainly *Reg.* 2861 of the Gospels, now 63 or *L.*— $\theta$ , is *Coisl.* 200, containing the New Testament, except the Apocalypse; in Wetstein and Griesbach it is *n. 38* in the Gospels, 23 in Paul, and 19 in the Acts and Cath. Epistles.— $\kappa$ , or *Reg.* 2870, Fleischer 102, ac-

of the New Testament appeared with Stephens' olive in 8vo. (without the name of the place where it was printed, though it is believed to have been Geneva,) accompanied by the Vulgate and the version of Erasmus. This was the first edition which contained the division into verses, invented by Stephens. . . . "*Novum Testamentum ad vetustissima exemplaria MSC. excusum: adjecta duplici translatione: in interiore quidem margine veteris interpretis, in interiore Desiderii Erasmi.*" . . . "Quod autem per quosdam, ut vocant, versiculos," says the Preface, "opus distinximus, id vetustissima exemplaria . . . secuti fecimus." We have repeatedly remarked that ancient MSS. are sometimes found divided into small sections in some degree similar to our verses.

In 1569, appeared another edition by his son Robert. "*Lutetiæ ex officina Rob. Stephani typographi regii, typis regii MDLXIX.*" 16mo. At the end are appended select various readings under the title: "*Selectæ variantes ex Stephani tertiâ.*"

All these editions possessed inestimable value in their day, although in reality they are extremely defective, as all first attempts of a novel description must be. Before this period a Codex, (which was now and then selected with discrimination, but frequently taken at hap-hazard,) was transcribed by some copyist, who collated a few MSS. with it in order to obtain assistance in illegible or doubtful passages, or to adopt here and there a reading which struck his fancy. Such was the case likewise in regard to these printed editions. The editors seized upon the best MSS. in their vicinity, without the slightest knowledge of the critical stores which were within their reach in the obscurity of libraries, or of the proper principles on which to proceed. And however superior in learning they may have been to the transcribers before them, they yet always acted without plan, amended like them according to their own fancy and private opinions, and in this respect were not even on a footing with the Greek copyists, since they knew less in respect to the characteristics which determined the age of MSS.

To us of the present day these editions would be far more valuable had each editor merely printed some one ancient MS. faithfully and carefully, without any exercise of criticism; if, e. g., (the Complutensian editors had given us the Rhodian Codex, as Hearne has given the

cording to Wetstein and Griesbach, 9 in Paul's Ep. and 7 in the Acts and Cath. Epistles.—*α*, Acts and Cath. Epistles. n. 8, Paul 10, in Wetstein and Griesbach; it is not known what has become of it.—*β*, Reg. 2862, of the Gospels, now 83 according to Fleischer. Griesbach, however, does not think these numbers perfectly certain. The readings are cited by him and by Wetstein under the designation n. 9. *Evang.*—*γ*, according to Marsh (last ed.) is *Cantabrig. kk. 6. 4.* See "*Letters to Mr. Archdeacon Travis in vindication of one of the Translator's notes to Michaelis' Introduction. By the Translator of Michaelis.*" Leips. 1795. 8vo. p. 49—70.—*δ*, of the Gospels, not Reg. 2885, but *Victorian. 774.* in the Library of St. Victor in Paris. (Griesbach *Symb. Crit.* P. 1. p. CXLIV—XLVI.) in Griesbach *Evang.* n. 120.—*ε*, Reg. 2869, according to Fleischer 237, contains Paul's Epist., Acts, Cath. Epist. and Apoc. It was collated by Wetstein anew; according to him it is n. 12 of Paul, n. 10 of the Acts and Cath. Epistles, and n. 2 of the Apoc.: so also in Griesbach.—*ς*, is, as Griesbach says, "*ignotus Codex Apocalypseos.*" The readings are cited by him and by Wetstein under the designation n. 3. Apoc.

Laudian Codex of the Acts or Woide the Alexandrian, simply accompanied by a preliminary account of its appearance and condition.

They therefore properly belong to the history of biblical literature and of the typography and cultivation of the 16th century, and may afford important information on other points; but they are of no use in the criticism of the New Testament, except in tracing back to their origin the mistakes and false readings in our printed editions.

### § 57.

There now arose a multitude of booksellers, who either reprinted some one of these four editions, or else prepared a new one from two or three of them.

Christopher Plantin reprinted at Antwerp the edition of Alcala five times, in 1564, 1573, 1574, 1590, 1591, and it issued from his press after his death in 1601 and 1612. Reprints of it appeared at Geneva in 1609, 1619, 1620, 1628, 1632.<sup>1</sup> It was also reprinted in the Paris Polyglot, in the 9th and 10th vols., in 1645. Lastly, it was printed likewise at Mentz in 1753; and to this edition Goldhagen subjoined various readings, among which are some from the *Codex Molsheimensis*, which still remained uncollated.

The editions of Erasmus were reprinted by *Wolffius Cephalæus, Argenteroti*, 1524, 8vo.; by Froben and Episcopius, 1545, 4to. *Ἐτυπώθη ἐν βασιλείᾳ παρ' Ἱερωνίμου Φροβηνίου καὶ Νικολάου Ἐπισκοπίου, ἐκτὶ τῆς θεογονίας αἰμα.* Also by Heerwagen, Basle 1545, folio;<sup>2</sup> by Nicholas Brylinger, Gr. and Lat., Basle 1546, and 1550, 8vo.; by Vogelín, Gr. and Latin. *Lipsiæ imprimebatur per Andream Schneider typis Voegelianis*, 1570; and by Leonard Osten, Gr. and Lat., Basle 1588, 8vo.

Among the reprints of Erasmus, however, two are so distinguished, that it would be wrong to confound them with the rest. The first is that of Simon Colinæus, Paris 1534, which indeed recognises that of Erasmus as its basis, but is not without merit of its own. The editor consulted ancient MSS. himself, and among them was *Victorian. 774*, which Stephens afterwards denominated *ιδ*, in Griesbach 120 of the Gospels, or else a MS. nearly allied to this, viz. *Reg. 2865<sup>b</sup>*, in Griesbach 119. In the Acts, the Pauline Epistles and the Catholic, he collated a MS. which Stephens subsequently designated *ια*.<sup>3</sup> From these copies and others, it seems, he altered the Erasmian text and, as he thought, often improved it. This edition was earlier than the first of Stephens, and might have disputed the palm with it, had it been supported by the public favor. But no one reprinted or followed it, and it therefore remained one of the secondary editions.

The other is that of James Bogard, who in 1543 followed the New Testament of Erasmus, with some alterations, particularly in the Apocalypse, subjoining an appendix from *Steph. ιδ*.<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Le Long Biblioth. Sacra Ed. Masch. P. I. p. 281—293.

<sup>2</sup> Millius Proleg. n. 1153.

<sup>3</sup> Bengel, Introd. in Cris. N. Test. § 36. p. 435. Griesbach, Symb. Crit. P. I. p. CXLVI.—CLIV.

<sup>4</sup> Wetstein, Prol. p. 142.



The *Biblia Antwerpiensia Philippi Regis* 1571, 72,<sup>1</sup> was based on the Bible of Alcalá, Erasmus being consulted. So also, the Plantinian Editions of 1572 and 1584. fol., with the interlineary version of Arias Montanus;<sup>2</sup> the Raphelengian at Leyden, 1591, 16mo.; and that of Comelin, with the same interlineary version, in 1599, large folio.

From the Erasmian and Aldine editions were derived the Hagenau edition: "*in ædibus Thomæ Anselmi Badensis, 1521 mense martis*;" that of Strasburg, by Fabricius Capito, 1524; the editions of John Bebel, with the preface of Ecolampadius, at Basle 1530 and 1535. 8vo.; and those of Thomas Plater in 1538, 1540, 1543, and 1544,<sup>3</sup> at Basle in 8vo.

The following was a reprint of Stephens' first edition: *Τῆς καινῆς διαθήκης ἅπαντα, Novum Testam. Parisiis, impensis viduæ Arnoldi Birkmanni* 1549, 16mo. One described by Le Long, (*Ed. Masch. P. I. p. 215.*) is said to agree perfectly in appearance with this, except that on the title-page there is the name of Haultin instead of Birkmann.<sup>4</sup>

The *Wechelii* faithfully reprinted the third ed. of Stephens in 1601, folio, with various readings in the margin. Still earlier in 1597, folio, they had printed the third and fifth editions of Stephens together, placing the various readings in the margin of Stephens' third edition beneath the text, and subjoining readings from the Bible of Alcalá and the Vulgate: "*Ad Novum Testamentum quod attinet*," says the Preface, "*exemplar Roberti Stephani typographi regii, patris et filii, secuti sumus, atque varias lectiones, quæ non tantum in eo exemplari ex codicibus regiis collectæ continebantur, sed et in Complutensi et in aliis editionibus, et quorundam adnotationibus reperiri potuerunt, adjici curavimus.*" These and especially the Aldine editions are the source of the *Margo Wecheliorum*, which Francis Junius composed, and to which great importance has sometimes been attached.

Stephens was followed likewise by the *N. I. C. Testamentum Græce, collatis non paucis venerandæ fidei exemplaribus, accuratissima cum lima editum per Nicol. Bryling.* MDLXIII. 8vo. In the margin, as in Stephens' third edition, there are various readings, which are in reality selected from the latter; yet the marks by which Stephens designated the MSS. are omitted. There are also noted some various readings which are not found in Stephens; e. g. Matt. 2: 2, προσκυνῆσαι αὐτόν. 5: 11 εἰπωσι πᾶν πονηρὸν κατ' ὑμῶν. 6: 34 μεριμνήσει ἑαυτῆς. 9: 4 καὶ εἰδὼς ὁ Ἰησοῦς. 15: 39 ἀνέβη. 17: 25 τὰ τέλη. 19: 24

<sup>1</sup> Bengel, *Introd. in Cris. N. Test.* p. 453. § 36. *Comp. Wetstein Prol.* p. 150.

<sup>2</sup> Curcellæus *Præf. in N. T. Wetstein Prol.* p. 151.

<sup>3</sup> Masch (*Le Long Bib. Sacr. P. I. p. 200*) doubted the existence of the edition of MDXLIV. It is, together with the other edition of Plater, in the Library of our University, and the editions of XLIII and XLIV resemble each other in every respect, except in date. The title, the dedication, "*Docto et pio M. Severino Ertzberger Basileensis Ecclesiæ communi diacono, Joannes Gastius Brisacensis Theologiæ Candidatus S. D.*," also the preface, "*in sacrarum literarum lectionem Johannis Ecolampadii exhortatio*," the text, the numbering of the pages, the subscription, are the same. The one in our Library is dated, like that of XLIII, in the month of March: "*Basileæ per Thomam Platerum, impensis Reinhardi Beck. A. MDXLIV mense Martio.*"

<sup>4</sup> Marsh's *Notes to Michaelis' Introd. I. Vol. p. 426.* Germ. translation.



εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τῶν οὐρανῶν εἰσελθεῖν. 21: 30 καὶ κύριε . . . ἐγὼ ὑπάρχω. 25: 22 ἐκέρδησα ἐν αὐτοῖς. These I have observed in Matthew; I find most of them, however, in Aldus, and the rest are, it would seem, taken from the Vulgate.

With these are to be reckoned Crispin's edition and Vögel's of 1564, with which I am not acquainted. The Vögelian at Leipsic, 1564, says J. D. Michaelis, and the Crispinian at Geneva 1553, follow Stephens throughout.

### § 58.

Since the time of Stephens biblical criticism had as yet made no advance; for all these reprints added nothing from MSS. yet uncollated to the fine collection which the former procured by means of his son. Nor did any one undertake to prepare a critical edition by making a proper use of the apparatus which was within his reach. Stephens himself wanted confidence for this, and only reprinted the fifth edition of Erasmus with some alterations, scattering his various readings in the margin for the advantage of any one among his purchasers who might choose to make use of them.

Such an one was Theodore Beza, a pupil of John Calvin, who appropriated to his own use the collations for which Stephens was indebted to his son Henry, and obtained, I know not from what quarter, an Arabic version, and also the Syriac one which had been sometime published through the laudable assiduity of Widmanstad. With these he began to criticise the text and to amend former editions, particularly that of Erasmus. It has been Beza's lot to be frequently much commended, and frequently much censured; both with equal reason. His emendations are often sensible; but his means for such an undertaking were too scanty, and no principles were as yet established in respect to their application.

His first edition was published without the name of the place where it was printed (Geneva,) by Henry Stephens: "*Jesu Christi D. N. Novum Testam. etc. Anno MDLXV. excudebat Henricus Stephanus illustris viri Huldrici Fuggeri typographus.*" The Greek text has by its side two Latin versions, the Vulgate and his own, and notes below, sometimes critical and sometimes exegetical. The dedication is to Elizabeth, queen of England, and in it he asserts that he made use of 25 MSS.: "*Ad hæc omnia accessit ex Stephani nostri bibliotheca cum VIGINTI QUINQUE plus minus manuscriptis codicibus, et omnibus pene impressis ab Henrico Stephano, ejus filio, et paternæ sedulitatis hærede quam diligentissime collatum.*" In 1576 a second followed, by the same printer; also a third, fourth and fifth in 1582, 1589 and 1598. In the second he mentions only *septemdecim MSpta.*; but in the fourth and fifth *novemdecim*. By claiming in the first edition to have used 25 MSS., which in the second dwindle down to 17, he has drawn on himself severe reprehension, even from his friends.

Yet I do not think that he was so inconsiderate as, after exaggerating somewhat in the first edition, to have forgotten himself in the second. It is probable, as has been alleged in his exculpation, that in the first edition he wrote XV, which the compositor mistook for XXV, and put

*viginti quinque* at length ; for there are 15 in Stephens' margin, without reckoning the Complutensian edition. By reckoning this, as Stephens did, together with the *Codex Claromontanus*, he would have *septemdecim*. He afterwards obtained an *antiquissimus Codex MST.*, mentioned by him in his last two editions ; by this the number is increased to 18. He could not have made nineteen, however, without reckoning the *Cod. Cantabr.* (which had meanwhile come into his possession) twice, once among Stephens' and once by itself.

Beza gave a different character to the text from that which it had had hitherto, and was the real author of the *Textus Receptus*. His learning and the special recommendation of being Calvin's pupil procured him reputation among his sect, and his Recension was highly esteemed in England,<sup>1</sup> and particularly in Holland and Switzerland.

Meanwhile no one had particularly distinguished himself among the scholars of the Lutheran persuasion. Their absurd controversies with the papists employed too many pens and prevented them from cultivating other departments of literature. To this is to be added the circumstance that the trade in books was principally confined to Holland. The Elzevirs turned this circumstance to good account, and without saying a word of the author circulated this recension in every country and among all sects, in several neat and even elegant editions.

The first Elzevir edition appeared without preface or postscript. "*Lugduni Bat. ex officina Elzeviriana, Anno MDCXXIV.*" 16mo. On the title-page there is only : "*ex regiis aliisque optimis editionibus cum curâ expressum.*"

The basis of this was certainly the text of the third edition of Robert Stephens, as this was the basis of Beza's ; and hence those learned men who have remarked a great agreement between it and the third of Stephens are in the right.<sup>2</sup> But the editors follow Beza wherever they differ from Stephens. Wetstein has noted several passages in which the text deviates from Stephens, and presents instead Beza's emendations. (*Proleg.* p. 151, 152.) Mill likewise perceived the variations, (*Prol.* p. 1307,) and if he had collated Beza, he would have found most of them in him. Birch<sup>3</sup> has given a supplementary list of some from the Gospels and also from the other books of the New Testament, among which however are several which did not escape his predecessors, as Mark 6: 9, Luke 15: 26, John 8: 25, 13: 30, 18: 54 ; together with several indeed, which he first pointed out, and which, on recurring to Beza, I find in him : e. g. Matt. 21: 7, Mark 8: 3, Luke 7: 12, 10: 19, and the most important one 17: 36 ; as also 18: 3, John 6: 28, 9: 20, 14: 9, 18: 20, 19: 30. Thus this fact, which I believe was first suggested by the Abbe Bengel, is sufficiently established.

The second edition : "*Ἡ καινὴ διαθήκη, Novum Testamentum. Ex regiis aliisque optimis editionibus, hæc novâ expressum: cui quid accesserit præfatio docebit. Lugd. Bat. ex officina Elzeviriorum.*"

<sup>1</sup> I am acquainted it is true with only one English reprint of Beza, in 1642, Cantabrig. folio.

<sup>2</sup> Le Long Bib. Sacr. Ed. Masch. P. I. p. 226.

<sup>3</sup> Birch Præf. ad IV. Evang. p. 4. Præf. ad var. lect. Actor. Epist. Pauli et Cathol. Hauniæ. 1793. Præf. ad var. lect. in Text. Apoc. Hauniæ. 1800.

CIΘIOCCXXXIII. 12mo. and a similar one in 16mo. boldly announced themselves in the Preface as the *textus receptus*. "*Textum ergo habes ab omnibus receptum, in quo nihil immutatum aut corruptum damus.*" As this assurance was credited, it soon came to be really well founded. These editions were soon followed by several others from this infallible press, in 1641, 1656, 1662, and in these five editions at least 8000 copies were sent forth to the world.

Stephen Curcellæus now appeared, and in order to restore the charm of novelty to these editions, selected various readings from the Wechelian margin, from some printed Bibles and a few MSS., and subjoined them as an appendix to an edition published in 1658 *apud Danielem Elzevirium*, and afterwards in an edition in 1675, inserted them beneath the text, without altering it otherwise in the least: "*Quæ ad præcedentes Elzevirianas expressa fuit, nullâ prorsus in textu factâ mutatione.*"

The Curcellæan edition became so profitable to the Elzevirs that, notwithstanding their frequent impressions, others also sought to derive advantage from it; as, e. g., Blaw, who reprinted the second edition of Curcellæus in the same year: "*Amstelodami ex officina Blaviana MDCLXXV. Sumpt. Societ.*" He had at a still earlier period evinced a like regard for the Elzevirs by reprinting their text of 1633: "*Amstelodami apud Guil. Blaw. 1633. 12mo.*"

That nothing might be lacking to promote the universal reception of this text, the orthodox Father Morinus took the trouble of presenting it in a splendid edition, Paris 1628, to the French clergy.

Moreover the booksellers Wetstein and Smith speculated with it in another way, out of charity to those poor sinners who could not well get along without a Latin translation. They printed by its side the version of Arias Montanus, and Leusden was called upon to superintend the edition, that it might be recommended by his name. Thus the text of the Elzevirs appeared anew, "*Amstelodami ex officina Wetsteniana, 1698.*" It was very often published in this form with these words on the title page, and likewise "*apud Wetsten. et G. Smith.*"

But for the further benefit of a learned public, they appropriated to their use the collation of a Vienna MS. (*Lambec. 28.*) made by Gerhard von Mastricht, together with the principles of criticism which had been drawn up by this learned man in his leisure hours. Thus enriched, the Curcellæan edition again appeared, "*Amstelod. ex offic. Wetstenianâ,*" in 1711, as also a second time, "*Amstelod. apud. J. Wetsten. et G. Smith,*" 1735, 8vo. The text itself remained unaltered; only, as they boast, it was printed with fewer errors: "*Textum emendavi*" says the Preface, "*ad editionem tertiam Elzevirianam Anni 1633 a Cl. Leusdeno mendis repurgatam.*" The letters by which the author of the rules of criticism (*XLIII Canones Critici*) is designated on the title page, viz. G. D. T. M. D., signify *Gerhardus de trajectu Mosæ Doctor*.

While the stream of the *textus receptus* was rolling on and carrying everything with it, Bœcler, it would seem, wished to signalize himself by recurring to the text of Robert Stephens. He published two editions of it: "*Ἡ καινὴ διαθήκη. Novum Testamentum. Accessit prologus in Epistolas S. Ap. Pauli ex antiquissimo MSC. Argent. ex offic. Stædelii A. CIΘIOCCXLV. and LX. in 12mo.*" It seems, however, that the first was merely provided with a new title page and sold as a



second. He says in the Preface: "*collatis etiam MSC. membranis, de quibus ad calcem libri.*" The MS., according to his description at the end, contained the Acts, the Pauline and Catholic Epistles, with the Prologue of Euthalius to Paul's Epistles, which he printed in the appendix. But Bœcler, as Bengel has already remarked, made no use of this MS. in regulating the text. I have taken pains to convince myself of this by investigation. His MS., it is well known, went to Rome, where Zacagni made use of it for his edition of Euthalius. Bœcler, however, confined himself to the *textus receptus*, only making alterations here and there according to Stephens' third edition. He adopted the readings of Stephens again in the following passages: Acts 16: 17, Rom. 12: 11. 1 Cor. 15: 23. 2 Cor. 5: 4. 11: 1. Phil. 1: 23. Apoc. 3: 12. 4: 10. 5: 9. 8: 5. 11: 1, 2. 13: 3, 5. 19: 1, 6. 20: 4. 21: 16.

### § 59.

While the Dutch were abusing the text according to their own good will and pleasure, in another country it passed from the hands of tradesmen and their assistants into those of men of learning. It was in England that it met with this good fortune. Walton and other learned individuals associated themselves together for the purpose of editing the London Polyglot. This was to contain the Syriac, Arabic, Æthiopic and Persian versions of the New Testament; aids to criticism of no small value.

The Greek text was treated with much more care than could have been expected in a work on a plan so extensive. The Dutch creed in regard to the *textus receptus* had no influence over Walton and his associates. He adopted the third edition of Stephens as the basis of his text, and placed below it the readings of the celebrated Alexandrian Codex A. The New Testament made its appearance in this way, "*Londini MDCLVII*," in the 5th vol. of the Polyglot.

The 6th vol. was appropriated to the purpose of presenting numerous readings of Greek MSS., most of which had not before been collated. Mill (*Proleg. n. 1372*.) reckons them by numbers up to sixteen, to which, that they may be better recognized, we subjoin their designations in Wetstein and Griesbach.—*N. I. Cantabr. D.*—*II. Ep. Paul. D.*—*III. Evang. 59.*—*IV. Epist. Paul. 30.*—*V. Evang. 64.*—*VI. Evang. 62.*—*VII. Evang. 61. Paul. 40. Act. et Ep. Cath. 34.*—*VIII. Evang. 56.*—*IX. Ep. Paul. 39. Act. et Ep. Cath. 33.*—*X. Evang. 57. Paul. 41. Act. et Ep. Cath. 35.*—*XI. Ep. 43.*—*XII. Evang. 58.*—*XIII. Act. Ep. Cath. 36.*—*XIV. Act. Ep. Cath. 37.*—*XV. Evang. 47.*—*XVI. Evang. Joann. 96.* Lastly the Velezian readings were likewise inserted.<sup>1</sup>

As to the rest, the editors of this valuable work contented themselves with the merit of laying their treasures before the learned world without exercising any criticism upon them.

<sup>1</sup> They have this name from Peter Faxard, Marquis of Velez, who was said to have collected them from 16 Greek MSS.; but it is now ascertained that they were extracted from the Vulgate and translated into Greek. La Cerda first disclosed this in his *Adv. Sacr.* Lugdun. 1626. fol. The fraud is most fully demonstrated by Herbert Marsh in the Appendix to his learned Notes on Michaelis' *Introd.* Vol. I.



But the numerous variations in MSS., which were disclosed by this work, disturbed the minds of many, and particularly, it would appear, that of the venerable Dr. John Fell, afterwards Bishop of Oxford. He entered deeply into an investigation of this point, collated several MSS. himself, and edited a New Testament, with a preface in which he endeavors to quiet the apprehensions of his readers. It appeared with the title: *Τῆς καινῆς διαθήκης ἅπαντα. Novi Testamenti libri omnes. Accesserunt parallela scripturæ loca, necnon variantes lectiones ex plus 100 MSS. Codicibus, et antiquis versionibus collectæ, e theatro Sheldoniano. A. D. MDCXXV. 8vo.*

He used as its basis, as he says in the Preface, the edition of Currellæus, in which he found Stephens' readings and a part of the Wechelian, and he united with them the collections in the London Polyglot. He himself, moreover, instituted a collation of 12 hitherto unexamined MSS. in the Bodleian Library; he procured the collation of two in the library at Dublin, of four others from France, and from Thomas Marshall the readings of the Coptic and Gothic versions. To these he subjoined the various readings which Caryophilus had collected from 22 Roman MSS.<sup>1</sup>

On the whole, we come to rather unfavorable conclusions respecting the hundred MSS. of which he boasts on the title page, since the Velezian are spurious, and those of the Wechels and of Stephens are identical.

It is more to the credit of this prelate that he incited Mill to employ his talents upon the New Testament, constantly animated his perseverance and energy, and afforded him his own efficient aid; that he did all that was in his power to cast his own work into the back-ground, and to cause himself to be surpassed by another, that science might be the gainer. Mill himself, speaking in his Prolegomena of the death of this illustrious man, tells with deep emotion, what a noble benefactor he possessed in him, and how much aid he lost by his decease.

Mill did not merely collect the various readings and write them beside or beneath the text of Stephens, (for he took Stephens' third edition as the basis of his,) without stating from what MSS. they came, where these MSS. were preserved, and what were their peculiarities, but he told the locality of these documents, and sometimes the numbers which they bore in the various libraries, and designated each by a peculiar mark for his own edition under which he quoted its readings, so as to inform his readers of the source of each of the variations he presented. He moreover, whenever and so far as it was possible, gave an account of each MS., as to its age and peculiarities, the accuracy with which it was written and its deficiencies. He did not collate them only here and there, and in particular passages, but in general made a continued collation of them from beginning to end.

---

<sup>1</sup> John Matth. Caryophilus, a native of Crete, collected these readings by command of Urban VIII. for the purpose of using them in an edition of the New Testament. This intention was dropped, and Possinus afterwards published them in his *Catena in Evang. Marci. Romæ 1673. folio*. These readings have sometimes been regarded as twin-brothers of the Velezian; but Birch discovered some of the MSS. which Caryophilus used, and has thus saved his credit. (*Proleg. ad IV. Evang. Hauniæ 1788. p. XXXVI.—XLIV.*, and *Proleg. in Var. Lect. Act. et Epist. p. IX. Hauniæ 1798. 8vo.*)

By these peculiarities his undertaking was essentially distinguished from all previous ones, and led the world to a detailed acquaintance with the text, its various fortunes in various MSS., and the numerous critical helps from which a more perfect exhibition of it might sometime or other be deduced.

He was himself deeply sensible of the utility of this mode of procedure; he would not go to work like his predecessors, blindly and at random. He could decide respecting the admissibility of MSS. and the importance of their evidence on proper grounds, from their age and value; or, after having examined so considerable a number of MSS., it was even safe for him to determine according to the majority of voices.

He had besides, by his great familiarity with MSS., acquired a peculiar sagacity in detecting additions, interpolations and suspicious alterations, by which his decision was often happily directed.

He examined anew most of those MSS. which Walton collated in the English libraries, and which we have before enumerated, as well as several of those from which Bp. Fell extracted readings. He collated besides Gosp. 50.—Gosp. 51., Paul. 38., Acts, Cath. Ep. 32.—Gosp. 52, 53, 54, 55.—Gosp. 60., Apoc. 10.—Gosp. 65, 66, 67, 68.—Gosp. 69., Paul. 37., Acts, Cath. Ep. 31., Apoc. 14.—Gosp. 70, 71, 75. He also obtained from others collations of *K. Cyprius* and Colbert. Gosp. 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33. and Gosp. 91. Thus he himself examined and extracted readings from most of the MSS. (from N. 45. according to Wetstein and Griesbach's designations up to seventy,) of the Gospels or whole New Testament existing in England, besides procuring the collation of many foreign ones by the hands of others.

In Acts he collated *E* or *Laud.* 3; in the Acts, the Epistles generally, and the Apocalypse, the following: 26 Paul. 21 Acts, Cath. Ep.—28 Paul. 23 Acts, Cath. Ep. 6 Apoc.—31 Paul. 25 Acts, Cath. Ep. 7 Apoc.—32 Paul. 26 Acts, Cath. Ep.—33 Paul. 27 Acts, Cath. Ep.—34, Paul., 28, Acts, Cath. Ep. 8 Apoc.—36 Paul. 30 Acts, Cath. Ep.—47 Paul.—From others he obtained the collation of *E. Sangerm.* Ep.—*Colb.* 17, Paul.—35 Paul. 29 Acts, Cath. Ep.—44 Paul. 38 Acts, Cath. Ep.—45 Paul. 39 Acts, Cath. Ep. 11 Apoc.—46 Paul. 40 Acts, Cath. Ep. 12 Apoc. Of the Evangelitaria he collated: 3—4—5—18—19—20—21.

He further made use of nearly all the ancient versions, and the citations of the fathers of the Church, which he collected with great industry.

The vast treasure which our indefatigable scholar had thus accumulated by the labor of thirty years he presented to the world in 1707, accompanied by excellent Prolegomena. *Oxonii e theatro Sheldoniano*, fol.

Mill survived but a few days the completion of his extremely laborious and meritorious work, which gave rise to a new and better era in criticism.

Soon after, Ludolph Küster procured the collation of certain MSS. at Paris, viz. *C* or *Ephræm*, *M* or *Des Champs*, *Evang.* 9—10—11—12—13—14—15, according to Wetstein's numeration. He procured from other quarters the collation of Gosp. 78. Griesb.—Paul. 48,

Acts, Cath. Ep. 42,—Apoc. 13. The only MS. which he himself collated was *B. Ep. Pauli*, or *Bærnerianus*. With these he sought to give peculiar recommendation to a reprint of Mill's work under his superintendence at Amsterdam in 1710. fol. This edition was again reprinted *Lipsiæ* 1723. fol. Küster's merit in regard to this edition is not very great, and it was an important oversight that he did not carefully insert Mill's *Appendix*.

### § 60.

The New Testament had encountered various fortunes in other countries before coming to Germany; and meanwhile no one of our countrymen had acquired any considerable reputation by his labors upon it.

Bengel is the first of the Germans who gained honor in this department of learning. He was occupied for several years during his ministerial duties, in the study of Mill's New Testament, and soon consulted some Latin and Greek MSS.; particularly *Evang.* 83—84—85—the two last of which contain only fragments of the Gospels; also *Ev.* 86 at Presburg, 97 of John and the *Evangeliar.* 24. Also 54, Epist. of Paul to the Romans,—55, Paul., 46, Acts, Cath. Ep.—53, Paul., respecting which, see the following monograph: "*Cod. Uffenbach. qui fragm. ad Hebræos continet, recenset, et specimen ære exsculptum* (by Dr. Henke). *Helmstadii* 1800."—52, Paul. Acts, Cath. Ep. 45., Rev. 16.—and *Augustanus* 7, "*chartaceus, continens Apocalypsin*" as he says "*cum exegesi Andreæ Cæsarensis*," which Wetstein and Griesbach neglected to mention in their catalogues. He procured through others the collation of *Wetst.* 87, of *V*, one of the Moscow MSS. of *Matthæi*, and hasty extracts of readings from *Basil. E.* as also *Ev. Bas.* 1 and 2.

But his merit did not consist in this; he collated only enough to develop his critical talents. But he was not indebted to circumstances or to valuable aids; his merit was based on himself and his own genius.

By long study he acquired a thorough knowledge of all the phenomena of the text, and was so well acquainted with the peculiarities and habits of the numerous critical documents as to deduce from his observations new principles of criticism for his guidance.

He first discovered that a number of MSS. coincided in certain characteristics and continued tolerably alike throughout. He distinguished for the time being two families of MSS., one of which he called the African and the other sometimes the Asiatic. This observation led him to simplify his mode of procedure in criticism, as all the various testimonies were easily referred to a few classes; and thus he really obtained rules, and gave the first impulse to the progress of criticism, the influence of which will last though his Bible should be forgotten.

His edition of the New Testament which was published at Tübingen by Cotta in 1734, 4to., exhibits in the outset nothing more than the text with select readings in the margin below; but an Apparatus follows the text, the first section of which presents rules of criticism, the second details authorities for the selected readings, and the third answers some objections which might be made to his undertaking.

Meanwhile a young and active man, possessed of more than ordina-



ry knowledge and qualifications was preparing to outstrip the Wurtemberg abbot. This was John James Wetstein of Basle. He had in 1730 announced his New Testament at Amsterdam by Prolegomena, of which Bengel had taken frequent notice; but the work itself first appeared at Amsterdam in two folio volumes in 1751-2.

That he had collected around him the whole apparatus of his predecessors is very evident; he also frequently went back to their sources himself, inspected their documents with his own eyes, and moreover examined and collated again some MSS. which Walton, Fell and Mill had used. England was however too thoroughly gleaned; he therefore directed his eyes to France, which offered him new treasures. His own native city, too, furnished him with some fine old copies which were not by any means sufficiently known.

He described the MSS. and designated their abode, with the numbers which they bore in the places where they were. It is true he did not detail their character and peculiarities with the minuteness of Mill; but he carefully investigated their age and determined it frequently more sagaciously, in a palæographical view, than Mill. He likewise gave to each of them in his edition a peculiar mark under which he cites its readings.

We will not speak here of his gleanings or hasty examinations in England; they constitute the smallest part of his merit. The list of the MSS. newly collated by him begins with a splendid document, (for we need not make any account of what Küster extracted from it,) viz. *C* or 1905, now 9 among the Paris MSS., which contains all the books of the New Testament, though with great chasms, and for well known reasons is well adapted to subject the eyes and the patience to severe trial. Then comes *E* of the Gospels, or *Basileens. VI.* 21. Of more modern MSS. there are (in the order of their numbers): 1 *Basil.*, New Testament, without the Apocalypse.—2, Gospels. Of the Coislinian MSS., 34, Gospels,—35, Gospels,—18, Paul. 14, Acts, Cath. Ep. 17, Rev.—36, Gospels,—37, Gospels,—38, Gospels 23, Paul. 19 Acts, Cath. Ep.—39, Gospels,—40, Gospels,—41, Gospels of Matt. and Mark; "*istos octo codices*" says he, "*quâ potui diligentia contuli.*" He further collated 72, Gospels, (before the MS. went to England)—89, (in Griesbach 90,) the whole New Testament with the exception of the Apocalypse, (which however he made use of only in the Gospels)—91, (in Griesbach, 92,) the Gospel of Mark—93, (in Griesbach 94,) Mark and Luke. Likewise *Cod. L.*, which fine MS., however, he only examined cursorily. From others he procured 44, Gospels,—73, Gospels,—in Griesbach 73, and 74.

The following *Evangelitaria* were collated anew by himself; 1—2—7—8—9—10—11—12—13—14—15—16—17—all *Colbertine*, and a Lectionarium, *Scaligeri Græc-Arab.*, of the Gospels, Paul's Ep., Acts, and Cath. Ep., throughout *n.* 6.

Of the Pauline Epistles he collated *D*, or *Claramontanus*, twice; likewise *E*, or *Sangerman.* and *F*, formerly *Augiensis*, a fine MS. Besides, 2 *Basil.*, Paul., Acts, Cath. Ep.—4 *Basil.*, Paul, Acts, Cath. Ep.—7 *Basil.*, Paul.—16 Paul., 11 Acts and Cath. Ep., 4 Apoc. Coislinian MSS. besides those before mentioned: 19 Paul. 16 Acts, Cath. Ep.—20 Paul.—21 Paul. 17 Acts, Cath. Ep. 19 Apoc.—22 Paul. 18



Acts, Cath. Ep. 18 Apoc. Also, 44 Paul. 38 Acts, Cath. Ep. Of uncollated English MSS.: 25 Paul.—26 Paul., 21 Acts, Cath. Ep.—27 Paul. Mill was indeed acquainted with 25 of the above, but does not reckon them in his list. From others he procured: Paul. *G.* and *H.*—Apoc. 26—27—28—and Apoc. *B. Basilianor.*, of which last however he could make but little additional use. In the whole there are more than forty *Codices* which were collected by him for the first time, or for the first time properly, without reckoning those collations which he procured from others. Besides the ancient versions already known, he first brought forward and employed the Philoxenian version.

Opinions have been different in regard to Wetstein's accuracy, as also in regard to his conduct and creed, and even his learning. He was probably, like all mortals, not always equally energetic in so laborious and dry employments; but when it was worth his while, e. g. in respect to *Cod. C* or *Ephraem*, he achieved wonders, as we are assured by one who has followed his steps with care and profound knowledge of the subject.<sup>1</sup> He has, however, fallen into mistakes, but oftener where he used materials furnished by others, than where he investigated and extracted for himself.

In my opinion, however, he may justly be blamed for not adopting and appreciating Bengel's excellent rules of criticism.

On the other hand, a peculiar merit of Wetstein is too commonly overlooked. The rich collection of explanatory passages from profane authors, from fathers of the church and the Rabbinical writings, which he has incorporated into his New Testament, evinces a mind which often saw further than the *exegetes* of his time, and perhaps, too, than some celebrated men of learning after him. I meddle not here with the doctrinal disputes in which he was involved. If he was a heretic in the Calvinistic and Lutheran, he may have been one too, in the Catholic church; but even where no doctrine is directly involved, we may see from his collections, although he seldom expresses his own opinion, what were the views of a man who noted such parallel passages and selected them from his multifarious reading.

May it not be in retaliation for the harsh judgments which he allowed himself to pass upon others, that he has sometimes been censured by those who have derived most benefit from his labors? It was a lamentable fate for a gifted and uncommonly learned man, that his native city, of which he was an ornament, did not appreciate him during his lifetime, and that after his death he was taken to task by those who enjoyed the fruits of his industry.

Shortly afterwards Germany acquired a scholar who converted Wetstein's treasure to general use and even added to it; and who, at the same time, knew how to appreciate and carry out the critical observations of Bengel. He confirmed the existence of certain recensions, which were followed by existing MSS. He speaks particularly of two of these, viz. the Alexandrian, as he terms it, and the Western; and alludes also to a third, which in his opinion was of more modern date than the others, and probably of Constantinopolitan origin. In the practical exercise of criticism he excelled Bengel in this respect, that he had a finer

---

<sup>1</sup> Griesbach. Symb. Cr. P. I. p. VI.

perception of the manner of individual writers and their peculiarities of diction, and selected his readings accordingly. It is easily seen that I am speaking of John James Griesbach.

His gleanings after Wetstein's collations and the new collations which he instituted, are treated at length in his *Symbolæ Criticæ*. Halæ. 1785. and Vol. II. 1793, which although published later than his New Testament, may be regarded as the preface to it. His New Testament appeared at Halle in two octavo volumes; the first in 1777, the second earlier, in 1775.

With this Testament I have gained a very familiar acquaintance, and when a young student, and not able always to use Wetstein as I wished, compared with it many folio volumes of the fathers of the church, in order to become familiar with the various phenomena of the text and their geographical relations. It was sometimes a source of perplexity that, when two readings are presented, one in the text and the other in the margin between the text and the authorities, it is not always apparent for which of the two readings the authorities enumerated below are cited. Otherwise it was, as a manual, a perfect work for the time when it appeared.

But it did not long continue thus valuable, for the industry of learned men was employed every where in searching for and bringing to light critical documents. Christian Frederick Matthæi, Prof. of Profane Literature in the University at Moscow, endeavored to make the best possible use of his residence in a place rich in MSS., and made the world acquainted with many treasures of this kind which, but for him, would have long laid in obscurity, and probably never have been presented to the world with so much accuracy.

Among a multitude of learned labors, by which the cause of classical and patristical literature has been advanced, he collated with indefatigable application the MSS. which were deposited in the Library of the Holy Synod, or preserved in other Libraries in Moscow.<sup>1</sup> In his preface to the Catholic Epistles he names more than seventy MSS. which were within his reach; in the preface to the Epistles to the Corinthians, these were increased to eighty-one. They soon rose still higher, and, with those which he collated after his return to Germany, amounted in all to one hundred and three Greek MSS. True, many of these contain only some one of the Evangelists, or a few of Paul's Epistles, and some even mere fragments; but among them are MSS. like *k* and *l*, comprehending the whole New Testament, some a half, and some a third, viz. the Acts and Cath. Epistles. A number of them are exceedingly valuable from their antiquity, as *V* and *g*. Moreover he selected useful annotations from such MSS. as were furnished with Scholia. The whole of this collection he published in twelve volumes 8vo. from 1782—8.

He did not consult his MSS. in individual passages merely, but examined them carefully throughout. He also gave good descriptions of them, and presented engraved specimens of several, by which he has very much embellished his work, and also rendered it much more useful, as

<sup>1</sup> At the end of the *Epist. ad Thessalonic*, p. 272, he gives an account "*de bibliothecis et codicibus N. T. Mosquensibus in genere.*"

by these aids he has facilitated the experienced reader's judgment in regard to them.

No one can deny that he has acquired distinguished and imperishable merit in New Testament criticism. I can easily comprehend how a man who has spent the best part of his life in labor of this kind, should be so sensitive in regard to every slight censure, and therefore I suppress the wishes which I have felt in regard to him. It has always, however, been my earnest desire that it were in my power to expunge certain violent passages from his work, that none of those who come after us may be disturbed in their esteem of a man who has so many valid claims to it.

He had not yet published his last volume, when Chs. Alter, Professor in the Vienna Gymnasium, appeared before the public with 23 Greek MSS. belonging to the Royal Library. He took for the basis of his collation the MS. *Lambec. N. I.*, (*Nessel N. XXIII*, and in Griesbach 218,) which comprehends, together with the Old, the whole of the New Testament, excepting that it is defective from Rev. XIII to the end. This MS. he printed entire in his 1st vol., except the passages where it is manifestly erroneous, which he supplied from Stephens' first edition. Yet, that we might have the Codex as it is, entire, he subjoined these errors also in the appendix.

With this, in a 2d and 3d Vol., he collated the following MSS.; two containing the whole New Testament except the Apocalypse, viz. Wetstein *N. 3* and Wetstein 75, (in Griesbach 76,) from which last Gerhard von Mastricht extracted readings in a superficial manner. Moreover, eight copies of the four Gospels, one of Matthew and the celebrated fragment of Luke, marked in Wetstein, *N.*, and two *Evangelistaria*. Besides these, four copies of the Acts, Paul and the Cath. Ep., one of which contained the Apocalypse also; one MS. with 12 Pauline Epistles; and two with the Apocalypse alone. To all this he added a new collation of the printed Coptic text and of some MSS. of the Slavonic version; also some readings from the old Latin version.

A description of most of these MSS., together with some specimens of them, had been given by Hermann Treschow in his "*Tentamen descriptionis codicum vet. aliquot Græcorum Novi Fæderis Msptorum, qui in bibliotheca Cæsarea Vindobonensi asservantur.*" Hauniæ 1773, 8vo. Respecting those which Treschow has not described as e. g., *Lambec. XXVIII. XXXII. XXXIII.*, we might reasonably have expected some information from the editor. The plan of this work, too, is of such a nature that the use of it is extremely inconvenient. It is well known, likewise, that Birch has examined some of these MSS. anew, and has occasionally presented us with readings from them which are not upon Alter's list, so that, it seems to me, Birch should have the praise of superior accuracy. Notwithstanding, Alter's "*Novum Testamentum Vindobonense*," drawn wholly from the treasures of the Royal Library, is a beautiful work. It appeared under the title: "*Nov. Testam. ad codicem Vindobonens. Græce expressum, varietatem lectionis addidit Carolus Alter. Viennæ 1787.*" 8vo. 3 vols.

This was indeed a golden age of criticism, when the learned emulated each other in drawing forth MSS. from their concealment and presenting them to the general use of the world. Among these learned



men Andrew Birch, Prof. at Copenhagen, claims peculiar merit. He examined a great number of MSS. for the Royal Danish edition of the New Testament. Some he collated partially; others, which seemed to be most deserving of such pains, throughout. First on the list is the celebrated Vatican MS. 1209, called *B* in Criticism, to which he devoted especial pains in the Gospels of Matthew and Mark, the Acts, the Pauline and Catholic Epistles. He obtained through Woide the collation of Luke and John which had been made for Bentley. He likewise collated twice *Cod. Vat.* 354. of the Gospels, written in 949 in uncial characters; *Cod. Vat.* 1067, likewise in uncial characters; *Cod. Vat.* 349. of the Gospels; *Cod. Vat.* 360; *Urbino-Vat.* 2, the Gospels, (which were taken according to the subscription from a very ancient copy,) twice carefully,—not to speak of the readings he extracted from the Roman MSS., from those of the Vienna Library, the Library of St. Mark at Venice, and those at Florence, or which he obtained through Moldenhauer from the MSS. of the Escorial, and through Hensler from the Library at Copenhagen. Adler also enriched his collection by collating for him the Gospels in the Syro-Hierosolymitan version, as he denominates it, and by various readings from the other Syriac versions. Birch has given a description of the MSS. and criticisms upon them in the copious Prolegomena which precede his work. It appeared with much typographical elegance under the following title: "*Quatuor Evangelia Græce cum variantibus a textu lectionibus codd. MSS. Bibliothecæ Vaticanæ, Barberinæ, Laurentianæ, Vindobonensis, Escorialensis, Hauniensis Regiæ, quibus accedunt lectiones versionum Syrarum, Veteris, Philoxenianæ et Hierosolymitanæ. Jussu et sumptibus Regis edidit Andreas Birch. Hauniæ. A. MDCCLXXXVIII. Excud. J. F. Schultz. Univ. Typogr.* 4to.

A large number of copies of this 1st. vol., and the materials prepared for the 2d., were destroyed by the unfortunate fire at Copenhagen in June 1795. Birch afterwards published in a separate form his collations of the Acts, the Pauline and Catholic Epistles, as also of the Apocalypse.<sup>1</sup>

Besides the Vat. MSS. 1209 and 1210, the collation of which is continued in these volumes, *Vat.* 367, a very remarkable MS. of the Acts, the Pauline and Catholic Epistles, is collated with peculiar care; also *Pio-Vat.* 50 and *Alexandrino-Vat.* 29, of which last the portion beyond the Epistle to the Ephesians has been destroyed. Besides these, *Borgian.* 4 and *Venet.* 10, which include the Apocalypse, were completely collated by Engelbreth. The MSS. moreover, in the Vienna and other libraries, which were examined only in particular chapters or Epistles, are very numerous.

Of the Apocalypse the following, besides the two already named, were collated throughout: *Vat.* 366, *Vat.* 579, *Vat.* 1136, *Vat.* 1166, *Alex.-Vat.* 68, *Pio-Vat.* 50.

<sup>1</sup> "*Varie lectiones ad textum Act. App. Epp. Cath. et Pauli e codd. Græcis MSS. Biblioth. Vaticanæ etc. collectæ et editæ ab Andrea Birch S. S. Th. Doctore et Profess. etc. Hauniæ. A. C. MDCCXCVIII.*" 8vo.

"*Varie lectiones ad textum Apocalypse ex codd. Græcis MSS. etc. collectæ et editæ ab Andrea Birch etc. Hauniæ A. C. MDCCC. prostant apud Proft et Storch.*"



The treasure of critical apparatus which had been thus accumulating was condensed, methodically arranged, and incorporated into a new edition of the Gr. Test. by a man whose uncommon qualifications for critical works of this kind we have before stated. With this work he adorned the evening of a laborious and praiseworthy life, and in it he left behind him an honorable memorial, which may perhaps be surpassed in respect to the critical materials it contains, (for these are daily increasing,) but hardly in regard to delicate and accurate criticism. It is entitled: "*Novum Testamentum Græce. Textum ad fidem codicum, versionum et patrum recensuit et lectionis varietatem adjecit D. Jo. Jac. Griesbach. Volumen I, IV Evangelia complectens. Editio secunda, emendatior multoque locupletior. Halæ Saxon. ap. J. Jac. Curtii hæredes et Londini apud Petrum Elmsly. 1796.*" 8vo. The 2d vol.: "*Nov. Testam.*" (as before) "*volum. IId Acta, Epistolas App., cum Apocalypsi complectens. Edit. sec. Halæ Saxon. et Londini apud Payne et Mackinlay. 1806.*"

The critical principles by which he was guided, he has unfolded in his *Commentarius Criticus in textum Novi Testamenti. Particula Ima Jenæ MDCCCII. Particula II. Jenæ MDCCCXI.* Both parts extend no further than through Matthew and Mark.

## CHAPTER VIII.

### VERSIONS OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.

#### § 61.

It was by the means we have been considering, that the Greek text was handed down to us through a course of centuries after its first publication; thus were its copies multiplied by the invention of the art of printing; such are the pains which have been bestowed upon it to restore it as far as possible to its original state, which had been so greatly changed by the course of time; and such are the preparations which have been made for the future, which, it is to be hoped, will one day accomplish what has not yet been done.

But we are in possession of documents which are much more ancient than the oldest MSS., and are of peculiar value in promoting our object. They are not in Greek, but in the languages of foreign nations; and could not, alone, restore to us a single Greek sentence, if the original were lost.

The original has been preserved; but, through the discrepancies of MSS., it is so unlike itself, that we are obliged at the outset to enquire what we shall select, and what discard. Now as we have before our eyes the Greek clauses and expressions respecting the choice or rejection

tion of which we are frequently in doubt, the documents we have mentioned may inform us whether their authors read a particular clause, or what phraseology or arrangement they found in the Greek copies of their day from which the versions were made.

This is the service which may be rendered us by the ancient versions ; to this extent are they of use in criticism ; and, so far as the antiquity of the testimony merits regard, some of them will even surpass the MSS. in authority. We are disposed, too, to ascribe to them further *anæxetetical* value in respect to obscure passages, because their authors were pretty near the period, the place of residence, and the mode of thinking of the Biblical writers.

This however can be the prerogative of immediate versions only ; for the mediate, i. e. those which were themselves made from versions, many indeed present the readings of the mother-version from which they sprang, but not those of the Greek text. They may, too, contribute to explain their mother-version, but not the original text, for this they do not express. Above all, however, the editions of these versions must be prepared with such ability and critical fidelity, that we can rely upon their accuracy.

We propose to arrange them, as far as possible, in the order of the countries to which they belong ; to speak first of the Asiatic, then of the African, and lastly of those which originated in Europe.

---

## SYRIAC VERSIONS.

### THE FIRST AND MOST ANCIENT OF THEM.

#### § 62.

Among the versions of the New Testament possessed by the Syrians in their native language, the *Peschito*, according to their unanimous declaration, is the oldest. It is called ܡܬܬܪܝܡܐ, i. e. the *Literal*, as some will have it, in order to denote its distinguishing characteristic. Yet it is by no means strictly literal ; but, without detriment to its fidelity, it exhibits a freedom inconsistent, it would seem, with this designation, or at least with the signification attributed to it. Abulfaragius, therefore, inclines to another interpretation of this word, and holds that this epithet was applied to it because it regards accuracy more than beauty and elegance of language.<sup>1</sup>

With the Jews, every representation of words in a foreign tongue is a תרגום. In the sacred books, however, they maintain a *double sense of the words* ; viz. פשוט, *the bare literal sense*, and מדרש, *the learned*,

<sup>1</sup> Greg. Abulfaragij Hist. Dynast. Dyn. VI. p. 100, Arabic text.

allegorical sense.<sup>1</sup> The Chaldee form of פְּשִׁיטָא is פְּשִׁיטָא and the Syriac פְּשִׁיטָא. The version of the Old Testament was clearly derived from the Hebrew text, and therefore was most probably made by the Jews, from whom it received its name. When the New Testament was added it was included with it under the same denomination.

The Chaldee Targums (we speak of the two oldest) were easily executed. Generally it was not even necessary to change the words, but only their form; the Syriac, however, was frequently forced to choose other expressions and to follow its own grammatical construction, so that the version differed from the preceding Targums, and as it exhibited the sense it became פְּשִׁיטָא, and from this characteristic, I imagine, was called ܦܫܝܬܐ.

### § 63.

The translator made his version from the Greek. This is proved by the many words which he has retained from the Greek exactly in the position which they occupy in the original, although frequently he might have used a pure Syriac expression. I have nowhere found so many of these as in the 27th chapter of Matthew, which is hence most proper to be cited as a specimen. V. 11, 12, seq. *ἡγέμων*. 6, *τιμή*. 7, *ἄγρος*, *ξένος*. 19, *βῆμα*. 27, *στρατιῶται*, *σπεῖρα*. 28, *χλαμύς*. 30, *πρόσωπον*.<sup>2</sup> 38, *λησταί*. 48, *σπύγγος*—no less than eleven words, all of which, except the title *ἡγέμων*, the Syriac translator had in his own language; and even for this last, as well as for the rest, he might probably have found an equivalent expression, if not an exactly correspondent one.

It is not denied that these words were current in Syria after the dominion of the Seleucidæ; but it is not at all probable that he would have used every one of these foreign words in preference to those of his mother-tongue, so frequently and exactly as they occur in the Greek Gospel, unless upon the supposition that he was led to do it by the Greek text which lay before him. In this chapter, moreover, Matthew has transferred some words from the Latin to the Greek, e. g. v. 26, *φραγελλώσας*. 27, *πραιτώριον*. 65, 66, *κουστωδία*, which the Syrian faithfully transferred. This custom prevails throughout the New Testament, and the whole proves more fully what we have inferred from a single chapter of Matthew.

The translator has also now and then committed mistakes which could have been occasioned only by the Greek text; e. g. Matt. 11: 19, *καὶ ἐδικαιώθη ἡ σοφία ἀπὸ τῶν τέκνων αὐτῆς*, he translates, *by her works*, having read *τεχνῶν* for *τέκνων*; in Matt. 23: 26, he renders *τῆς παροψίδος* by *rim* or *handle*, which he would not have done had he not read *ᾠψίδος*, or rather the unusual form *παραψίδος*; in Mark 6: 1, he read *ἐκολλήθησαν* for *ἠκολούθησαν*; and in Luke 12: 42, *ἔρρωψεν* for *ἔρρωξεν*. In Luke 5: 10, also, the translation of *ἔση ζωγρῶν* is remark-

<sup>1</sup> Hottinger, Thesaurus Philologic. seu Clavis Sac. Scripturæ, Edit. III. in L. I. c. II. sect. 7. De sensu sac. script. p. 233—37. Schickard, Bechinath Haperuschim. Disput. VI. ta. p. 116. Buxtorf. Lexic. Talmud. Rabbin.

<sup>2</sup> The reading which he had here was *ἐμπτύσαντες εἰς τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ*, which is also given by *Cod. Vercellens*, and *Veronens*. in Blanchini.

able; *thou shalt catch to life*. In Acts 9: 1, he read *ἐμπλεως* instead of *ἐμπνέων*; and 16: 29, *αἰδήσας*, *setting on fire*, for *αἰτήσας*, *asking*. A singular mistake occurs in Acts 18: 7, where he read instead of *ὀνόματι τοῦ σπουδαιου* *σεβομένου*, the words, *by the name of Titus the pious*. Hence he divided thus: *ONOMA-TIIOTYS-TO-Y-SEBOMENOT*, and prolonged the stroke at the top of the second *l* in *TIIOTYS*, so as to make *TITOTYS*. In the Epistle to the Romans, 2: 18, he changes *διαφέροντα* into *συμφέροντα*; in Galat. 2: 2, he must have read *κατιδὼν τοῖς δοκ.* . . . instead of *κατ' ἰδίαν τοῖς δοκοῦσι*, for he translated it *ܣܕܕܐܢܐ I showed it* etc.; in Eph. 6: 12, he changes *ἐπουρανίους* into *ὑπουρανίους*; and in Philipp. 2: 16, *λόγον ζωῆς* into *τόπον ζωῆς*. In James 2: 13, *KATAKATXATAIEAEOΣ*, he joined the last syllable of the verb to *έλεος* and read instead of *AI* the preposition *AI—AIEAEOΣ*, and instead of *KATAKATXAT, KATATXETE*, thus obtaining *καταύχετε δι' έλεος κρίσεως* which sense he expresses in his version.

### § 64.

So far as is known, all the MSS. of the Peschito, one alone excepted, contain only the following of the Catholic Epistles, viz. that of James, the first of Peter and the first of John; i. e. four less than the Greek MSS. The Apocalypse likewise is wanting. The four other Epistles in the Syriac version, the 2d of Peter, 2d and 3d of John, and Jude, are not by any means on a level with the Peschito, either in the mode of representing the original in a foreign tongue or in its other characteristics. They are constrained and laboriously literal, evincing no regard to purity of diction, no very clear insight into the meaning of the original, and no great capacity on the part of the translator. Pocock found them in a MS. in the Bodleian Library, which contained the Acts and the three universally acknowledged Catholic Epistles, according to the old version, together with those of which we are speaking, which he published separately.<sup>1</sup>

Dionysius Bar Salibi, a Syriac writer of the 12th century, says in his observations on the Philoxenian version of the Catholic Epistles, in the Preface to the 2d of Peter: "The 2d Epistle of Peter was not translated with the other Scriptures which were anciently rendered into the Syriac, and is to be found only in the version of Bishop Thomas of Char-  
kel."<sup>2</sup>

It is stated at an earlier period by Cosmas, an Egyptian scholar in the

<sup>1</sup> After three lines of Syriac follows the remainder of the title: "*Epistolæ quatuor, Petri secunda, Johannis secunda et tertia, et Judæ, fratris Jacobi, una, ex celeberr. Bibliothecæ Bodleianæ Oxon. MS. exemplari nunc primum depromptæ, et caractere Hebræo, versione Latina, notisque quibusdam insignita, operâ et studio Edwardi Pocock, Angli-Oxonien-sis. Lugdun. Bat. ex officina Bonavent. et Abrah. Elzevir. Acad. Typogr. A. 1630.*" 4to. From this edition, according to a work of Antony Vitre against Gabr. Sionita, these four Epistles were inserted in the Paris Polyglot; the differences between the two are only arbitrary alterations by Sionita.

<sup>2</sup> Pocock in Præf. ad quatuor Epist. Cath. Comp. Hassencamp's "*Anmerk. über die letzten §§. der Eint. des Hofr. Michaelis.*" p. 14, 15.



middle of the 6th century, called *Indicopleustes* from his oriental travels, that only three Catholic Epistles are to be met with among the Syrians, viz. that of James, the first of Peter and the first of John.<sup>1</sup>

To revert to Dionysius Bar Salibi, he asserts that these epistles were found only in the version of Bishop Thomas of Charkel, meaning the Philoxenian, which, as we shall soon see, was revised by Thomas of Charkel, who was subsequently bishop of Germanicia. Certainly, then, Bar Salibi knew nothing of the Epistles which since Pocock's time have been introduced into editions of the Peschito, for, though they sometimes resemble the Epistles in the Philoxenian version, they differ from them very much in their readings, in the choice of words and in the freedom of manner.

Or if the words of Bar Salibi be supposed to mean that Thomas made a translation of his own of the epistles of which we are speaking, his declaration would be untrue in another way; for they were not to be found merely in the version of Thomas of Charkel, but also in the Philoxenian. It is therefore every way most probable that Bar Salibi was not acquainted with the version of the four Epistles which is now printed with the editions of the Peschito.

As we have already mentioned, the Apocalypse, too, is wanting in MSS. of the Peschito. At least, that which appears at the end of some editions of the Peschito is certainly no part of this version, as is evident from its internal character. The mode of translation resembles rather that of the four Catholic Epistles just mentioned; e. g. in the custom of expressing  $\delta$ ,  $\eta$ ,  $\tau\acute{o}$ , by  $\text{ܐܢܝ}$ ,  $\text{ܐܢܝܐ}$ , etc. which frequently happens so many times in a single verse as to be absurd; e. g. in Rev. 5: 5, where it occurs four times and is needed only once; so too in the especial care taken to express  $\epsilon\sigma\tau\iota$  and  $\epsilon\iota\sigma\iota$  by  $\text{ܕܐܝܢ}$  and  $\text{ܕܥܝܢܐ}$ ; also in the ungrammatical omission of all suffixes to nouns and verbs, which, in order to give the force of  $\alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\varsigma$ ,  $\alpha\upsilon\tau\eta$  in Greek, are followed by the particle  $\text{ܐܝܢܐ}$ , as happens in Rev. 2: 13, no less than five times.

If this version be not the Philoxenian, it certainly arose from it. Learned men, indeed, say that it neither agrees exactly with it, nor is entirely different from it. I cannot surmise on what they found their assertion, for the Apocalypse of Philoxenus is not found in any of the MSS. of his version hitherto discovered. The description given of the MS. from which it was first published reminds us of the Philoxenian version. "Versuum distinctiones," it is said, "libellus iste proprie habet nullas, et nec capitum; nisi quæ a lectore quodam, nescio quo, nostris numeris adscripta fuerunt. Sententiarum tamen *distinctiones habet varias*, quarum quædam longiores, aliæ breviores periodos discernere videtur, quas nos hic non gravate omisimus, tum quia typographus iis carebat, tum quia nos certum earum usum non deprehendebamus. Aliquando enim *tota pagina habet nullam*, interdum *una multas*, ac non-

<sup>1</sup> Cosmas Indicopl. *De Mund.* l. VII. in Galland's *Biblioth. Patr.* T. XI. p. 535. Παρὰ Σύροις δὲ εἰ μὴ αἱ τρεῖς μόναι αἱ προγεγραμμέναι οὐχ εἰσέκονται. λέγω δὲ Ἰακώβου, Πέτρου, καὶ Ἰωάννου.

nunquam sine ulla sententiæ distinctione solius elegantiae causa cumulas, priores *quatuor punctis rubris, circulum nigrum ovali forma constantem, quadrangulâri forma continentibus*: posteriores *quatuor solummodo punctis, duobus rectis rubris, aliis transversis nigris*, pinguntur. Aliæ etiam aliter insigniuntur etc." And some pages after: "Non est autem dissimulandum in ipsius *autographi margine* errata varia a lectore quodam, nescio quo, sed alia manu, alio atramento emendata conspici: item *verba quædam in autographo occurrissete redundantia aut bis scripta*, quæ manifesto sensum vitarent, quæ nos reseuimus."

The MS. was written by one Caspar of India, as he calls himself at the end of it.<sup>1</sup> He, however, resided in the West, it would seem, and was in the service of the *Congregatio de propagandâ fide*. The Library of the Orphan House at Halle contains a MS. Liturgy of the Chaldee form, in Syriac characters, to which an ancient hand has given the following title: "*Ordo baptizandi juxta ritum Chaldæorum lingua Chaldaica . . . descriptus per Gaspar de Malavar, Indum, . . . Romæ, mense Julii, MDLXXX.*"<sup>2</sup> The name and country of the copyist are the same in both; a comparison of the characters would be decisive.

The present printed Syriac version of the Apocalypse formerly belonged to the younger Scaliger; from him it went to the library of Leyden University. From this MS. it was published by *Louis de Dieu*, from whose preface the description of it given above was extracted.<sup>3</sup> The text was afterwards incorporated into the Parisian and London Polyglots, and has been appended to some editions of the Peschito.

### § 65.

The copies of the old Syriac version, therefore, did not, at least after the 6th century, contain the 2d Epistles of Peter, the 2d and 3d of John or the Epistle of James; and after a certain period, we know not precisely when, they had likewise no Apocalypse. Yet the Græek Bibles contain all these and it does not appear that they were ever discarded from the sacred Codex, different as were the opinions respecting them.

I cannot persuade myself that the Peschito originally wanted the Apocalypse, because this book is supported by witnesses in the East of so weighty a character as Justin Martyr in Palestine, and Theophilus of Antioch, head of the principal church in Syria. The necessary conclusion therefore would be, that the Peschito was not composed till after the anti-allegorical controversies of Nepos, when several of the Oriental fathers had embraced the opinion of Dionysius of Alexandria; i. e.

<sup>1</sup> Adler cites several MSS. of the New Testament written in India in *Noz. Test. Vers. Syr. denuo examinata*. Hafniæ 1789, 4to. p. 24, 25, 26.

<sup>2</sup> Herbert Marsh's Notes and Additions to J. D. Michaelis' Introd. translated by Rosenmüller, (1 Th. Götting. 1795, 4to. p. 162.)

<sup>3</sup> *Apocalypsis Sancti Johannis, ex Manuscripto exemplari e bibliotheca clariss. viri Josephi Scaligeri deprompta, characterè Syro et Ebræo, cum versione Latina et notis, opera et studio Ludovici de Dieu*. Lugdun. Bat. ex typogr. Elzeviriana. 1637. 4to. This ed. was reprinted at the end of Lud. de Dieu's "Critica Sacra," fol. Amstelodam. 1683.

late in the 3d, or in the early part of the 4th century; which I can still less induce myself to believe.

Both these opinions being improbable, there remains but one other; viz. that the Apocalypse gradually disappeared from the old Syriac version, in the 4th century.

The proof of this is extremely simple. Ephræm, as well in his works which yet exist in the original, as in those which were translated into Greek in the 4th and following centuries, frequently refers to the Apocalypse, even mentioning its author by name.<sup>1</sup> Ephræm could not have done this, had not a Syriac version of it existed; for he had no acquaintance with Greek.

I know, indeed, that it has sometimes been asserted by the learned that Ephræm was skilled in Greek, but they have not exhibited any authority for the affirmation so unhesitatingly made. We are assured of precisely the contrary by ancient and trustworthy testimony. Sozomen, himself an Oriental, born in Palestine, educated in Baruth in Phenicia, where in his time was a celebrated school, and who lived at no remote period from Ephræm's day, states this; and Theodoret of Antioch, Bishop of Cyr in Syria, even wonders that he should have been able to combat so successfully the heresies of the Greeks without a knowledge of their language. Probably some of the learned men have confounded him with Ephræm, the patriarch of Teupolis, to whom Photius attributes, besides a knowledge of the Syriac, a more than ordinary acquaintance with the language and literature of the Greeks.<sup>2</sup>

Yet a later writer, of considerable merit in regard to biblical criticism, even names his instructor in Greek, stating that it was Basil, Bishop of Cæsarea. I cannot say on what authority he states this, as I have only seen extracts from his work.<sup>3</sup> The authority, however, cannot be of any weight, since Basil's brother or, if not he, an ancient and respectable writer, who composed a life of Ephræm, knew nothing of such a circumstance. He tells us that Ephræm visited Basil—visited him at an age when there is little success in learning languages, and when Ephræm was already made famous by his works.<sup>4</sup> Ephræm speaks himself of this visit, says that the Bishop addressed him through an interpreter, and communicates the subject of their conversation.<sup>5</sup>

He must certainly therefore have learned Greek late in life, speedily and miraculously, in some such way as is represented in a life of Basil attributed to Amphilochius. Basil, (the biographer informs us,) during a

<sup>1</sup> Opp. Syr. T. II, p. 332. Opp. Græc. T. II. p. 53. and p. 194.

<sup>2</sup> Sozom. H. E. L. III. C. 16. *Περὶ Ἑλληνικῆς παιδείας ἄμειρος*. Theodoret. H. E. L. IV. C. 29. *παιδείας γὰρ οὐ γεγενημένος Ἑλληνικῆς, τοῖς τε πολυσχεδεῖς τῶν Ἑλλήνων διέληγξε πλάτωνος κ. τ. λ.*

<sup>3</sup> Photius Cod. 223.

<sup>4</sup> Spohn "De ratione textus biblici in Ephræmi Syri commentariis obvii, ejusque usu critico." Leips. 1786, 4to. Eichhorn's *Allg. Biblioth. der bibl. Litter. I. B. I. St. p. 137*.

<sup>5</sup> Gregorii Nysseni de vita Ephræm Syri etc. Opp. Tom. III. p. 605. edit. Ducei.

<sup>6</sup> Cotelerii Monum. Eccles. Græc. T. III. p. 58. Basilii vita in Opp. Basil. T. III. Garnerii § XXIX. n. 4. Ephræm. Encom. Basilii T. III. Opp. Ed. Vossii. Colon. 1603, fol. p. 712.

three days visit which the Syrian father paid him, obtained of God by his prayers, that his guest should be able to speak Greek, which he instantly did to his own astonishment.<sup>1</sup> If we reject the miracle we have but a *Trifolium Græcum* remaining; but even this is ill attested, for criticism has long since pronounced its just sentence on this biography.

Now if he had not learned, and did not understand Greek, there must have been a Syriac version of the Apocalypse which he read. The same is true in regard to the Epistle of James, the 2d of Peter and 2d of John<sup>2</sup>.

The learned men of Göttingen object on the other hand that Ephræm quotes Greek words in his Commentaries. But they are only single words in very few passages, respecting which he might easily, if he wished to know how the Septuagint read, have inquired of his brother monks. I do not give the reply on mere conjecture; his Syrian biographer furnishes it for me. Ephræm, he says, when he travelled to Egypt, took with him one of his pupils as a Greek interpreter.<sup>3</sup> In this passage we have, first, another evidence that he was unacquainted with Greek, and secondly, an explanation how he obtained the single words which occur in his Commentaries. I must be pardoned, then, if I steadily persist in maintaining that Ephræm read in some version the disputed Epistles and the Apocalypse, which he frequently quotes.

### § 66.

But while we are striving to restore some parts of the old Syriac version which have in later days been severed from it, a celebrated man attempts to deprive it of a possession, which till his time no one disputed; viz. the Epistle to the Hebrews.<sup>4</sup>

In this Epistle, he says, when Paul refers to the Old Testament, the passages are quoted according to the Peschito; and hence he concludes it must have been translated later than other books of the New Testament in which this is not the case. For it is certainly to be supposed that the Christians translated the New Testament first, and then the Old, into Syriac. But this celebrated writer should not have relied upon supposition, when fact was at hand. The case is the same in the Gospels, the Acts and Epistles; not invariably indeed, but, as it would seem, only when the passages in the Syriac Old Testament were before the translator or were readily found. The citation in Matt. 19: 4, 5, is exactly transcribed from the Syriac version of Gen. 2: 2, 4; and Matt. 21: 5, is taken from the Syriac of Zechariah 9: 9, except the words which do not occur in the Evangelist, although the Syriac does not express Matthew's *τοῦ ὑποζυγίου*. Sometimes the Old Testament is quoted with such alterations as are necessary to make it like the words of the New. Thus in Matt. 12: 18, the beginning of the passage does not strictly ad-

<sup>1</sup> Gerard. Voss. T. I. Opp. Ephræmi, p. XIII.

<sup>2</sup> These Epistles are cited by Ephræm in the following places: Ep. Judæ. T. I. Opp. Syr. p. 136. Opp. Græc. T. III. p. 62, 63. Secund. Pet. T. II. Opp. Syr. p. 342. Opp. Gr. T. II. p. 387. Secund. Joann. T. I. Opp. Gr. p. 76. T. III. p. 52.

<sup>3</sup> Vita S. Ephræm § 15. p. 39. Asseman. Biblioth. Orien. T. I.

<sup>4</sup> Michaelis' Introduction. 1 Th. § 53. p. 363 seq. 4th Edition.



here to the Syriac of Isaiah 42: 2; but the two verses from οὐδὲ κραί-  
γασει το τυρόμενον οὐ σβέσει are entirely from Isaiah. So Matt. 13:  
14, the words from ἀκοῇ ἀκούσετε το τοῦ λαοῦ τούτου are taken un-  
changed from Isaiah 6: 9; while the rest is more closely assimilated to  
Matthew's phraseology.

The long passage, Acts 4: 25—29, is taken entirely from the 2d  
Psalm in the Peschito; and so likewise Acts 8: 32, 33, from Isaiah  
53: 7, exactly according to the Syriac version of that prophet, except  
one word which does not occur in Luke. Rom. 9: 29, is taken from  
Isaiah 1: 9, and Rom. 11: 9, 10, from Psalm 59: 24, 25, although there  
is not an exact agreement with the words of Paul.

It may be true, as this learned man says, that we cannot but suppose  
the Christians would translate the New Testament before the Old; but  
what if the Jews translated the latter? They may have had a Syriac  
Targum as others had a Chaldee one. The facts before us require  
such a supposition, and two other besides are explained by it. The  
first of these is that the Syriac Old Testament is translated from the  
Hebrew; the second that it is often changed to conformity with the  
LXX. The Jews did the former, and the Christians, who had for some  
time been accustomed to the Alexandrian version, the latter.

Thus the principal objection against this Epistle, and one to which  
Michaelis attributes very great importance, falls to the ground of itself.  
“In all other parts of the version of the New Testament the high priest  
is always called ܐܠܗܐ ܕܡܪܝܚܐ, but in the Epistle to the Hebrews ܐܠܗܐ

ܐܠܗܐ ܕܡܪܝܚܐ; and this is a proof that the latter was translated by a different  
hand.” A somewhat important deduction from a single word!

Paul, in order to prove the high priesthood of Christ, appeals to Ps.  
110: 4, and the translator took the cited passage from the Syriac Psalter,  
where the expression : ܐܠܗܐ ܕܡܪܝܚܐ ܕܡܪܝܚܐ, is used. Now with  
such premises as he had (Heb. 5: 6). he could not in his conclusion  
use the expression ܐܠܗܐ ܕܡܪܝܚܐ, but must have inferred that he was ܐܠܗܐ ܕܡܪܝܚܐ.  
He could not say: It is written he is *Summus sacerdos*, and then infer  
that he was *Summus pontifex*. To justify such a conclusion the identity  
of the two expressions must first be shown, so as to connect the prem-  
ises and conclusion; and the translator by such a change of words  
would have deprived the argument of its validity. In chapter 7: 17,  
this argument occurs a second time, and is so interwoven throughout  
with the contents of the Epistle, by means of positions deduced from or  
referring to it, that the translator, however accustomed to the word  
ܐܠܗܐ ܕܡܪܝܚܐ, was obliged to renounce it, and confine himself in this Epistle  
to the expression which the biblical quotation adduced in proof made ne-  
cessary.

We cannot from the fact that a translator does not every where em-  
ploy the same word, or express the same idea, in the same manner, in-  
fer immediately a different method of translation and a different trans-

lator, as has been done by a foreign scholar.<sup>1</sup> Because the extremely simple expression in Rom. 1: 17, *ὁ δίκαιος ἐκ πίστεως ζήσεται*—ܐܝܬܐ ܠܕܝܢܐ ܠܕܝܢܐ ܠܕܝܢܐ, is rendered differently in Gal. 3: 11, ܐܝܬܐ ܠܕܝܢܐ ܠܕܝܢܐ ܠܕܝܢܐ, may we therefore attribute the translation of the Epistles to the Romans and Galatians to different authors?

The same expressions often have, or seem to the translator to have, different meanings. This is the case in Heb. 10: 29, in regard to the word *κοινός*. The signification *polluted*, expressed by ܐܝܬܐ must certainly have appeared harsh to the translator, and ܐܝܬܐ, which is used for it elsewhere in the Peschito, signifies something *in common*, which is not the meaning here, (see Tit. 1: 4, Acts 4: 32.) Now it was clear that he must adopt a peculiar expression for a wholly peculiar sense, as he does: *who counted the blood of the covenant as common human blood*, ܐܝܬܐ.

To maintain the fact of different translators from the use of different expressions, will require a more extensive induction than one of three or four words. Let us profit by the honest admission with which the German opponent of this Epistle himself prefaces his objections, an admission not merely relating to a few words, but to the mode of procedure, the judgment, taste, and ability of the translator: "True," says Michaelis, "it (the version of this Epistle) exhibits much similarity to the Peschito, an equally pure and easy Syriac style, equal freedom from slavish literalism, and is about as accurate." Thus far Michaelis—and now it may be well further to call to mind the circumstance that Ephræm possessed a version, and, as we see, notwithstanding his free citation of some passages, had it in his biblical Codex and made use of it in his Syriac works.

### § 67.

Notwithstanding, it has seemed to me that the Peschito of the New Testament was not made throughout by a single hand. The manner of the translator has appeared to me more free in the Acts and Epistles than in the Gospels; and even in diction I have thought I observed some difference. But I have not noted down my observations so carefully as to be able to found a solid and forcible argument upon them.

The Greek text which was the basis of the Peschito possessed the following peculiar characteristics. It contained many readings which occur only in the writings of the fathers of the Church before the 3d century. Some of its peculiarities may perhaps be found in copies of the old Latin version before Jerome's time, and several of them in the celebrated MS., so remarkable for its license, preserved at Cambridge. It does not, however, adhere steadfastly to any text, but agrees some-

<sup>1</sup> Herb. Marsh's Notes and Additions to Michaelis' Introd. Germ. Trans. I. Th. p. 136, 137.

times with this and sometimes with that; and often takes its own course entirely unaccompanied. Yet it has not so considerable variations from the greater number of MSS. as the copies in the possession of Clement of Alexandria seem to have had, or those of the Latins before Jerome; and, although it frequently harmonizes with the Cambridge MS., its singularities are by no means so great and numerous as those of the latter.

We therefore perceive plainly that the text follows no fixed standard, and that the Codex from which the translator made his version did not belong to any one of the families of MSS.; that it resembled sometimes one and sometimes another, but in reality was entirely independent.

From these well founded observations it appears that at the time when this version was undertaken, neither Syria nor Palestine were in possession of those Recensions which produced harmony in their biblical MSS. and established a fixed text. It must therefore have been composed at least as early as during the first half of the 3d century, if indeed its purity, which elevates it above the text of this period, may not claim for it still higher antiquity.

### § 68.

So far we have been guided by critical characteristics in our investigation of this document with reference to the time at which it originated. We will now see what information on this subject we can derive from other facts.

The works of Ephræm the Syrian, in which the version is quoted,<sup>1</sup> prove that it had been introduced into use in the churches in the first half of the 4th century. Before his time Jacob of Nisibis, who is also called Ephræm's preceptor, flourished as a Syriac writer and must have found a Syriac Bible necessary in his exhortations to the people. In the 3d century Archelaus, Bishop of Carchara, Caschara, or Carhæ, (for the Greek writers sometimes spell it one way, sometimes another,) published a refutation of Manes in Syriac, which was translated into Greek as early as sometime in the following century.<sup>2</sup> These are clear indications of a Syriac literature, the commencement of which was still earlier.

All these appearances meet our view not in the Roman portion of Syria, or within the limits recommended by Augustus to be set to the empire, but upon the Euphrates, at Edessa, Nisibis, Charrhæ, in northern Mesopotamia, where the petty kings of Osroene and Edessa maintained themselves, sometimes under the protection of the Parthians, and sometimes under that of the Romans. Here the language of the country was first cultivated after the fall of the Seleucidæ and produced valuable fruits of native literature.

<sup>1</sup> Storr, "Observationes super N. T. versionibus Syriacis. Stuttgardiæ, 1772." § 4. p. 10—14.

<sup>2</sup> Hieronym. de Script. Eccles. V. Archelaus, "Archelaus episcopus Mesopotamiæ librum disputationis suæ quam habuit adversus Manichæum, exeuntem de Perside, Syro sermone composuit, qui translatus in Græcum habetur a multis. Claruit sub imperatore Probo, etc."

Here Bardesanes, in the 2d century, employed the language of the country in various departments of learning. He published a book *De fato*, the existing fragments of which evince more than ordinary knowledge.<sup>1</sup> He wrote likewise treatises on Marcion's system, as also essays and writings against other heretics in great numbers, which were translated by his friends into Greek.<sup>2</sup> Jerome, who had seen them, exclaims respecting them, in his lively way: "If such brightness beams even in the translation, what must it be in the original!"<sup>3</sup>

Harmonius, his son, although he had been instructed in Greek literature at Athens, rivalled the reputation of his father as a writer in the language of his own country. He was the favorite poet of the Syrians; and it was to supplant his not very pious or orthodox songs, which however were received with impassioned delight, that Ephræm at a later period published some sacred hymns which he had composed to the airs of Harmonius.<sup>4</sup>

We are forced to believe that, at a time when the native literature of the country had reached such a point of advancement as it had among the Mesopotamian Christians in the days of Bardesanes and Harmonius, a version of the Bible, if it were not already in existence, could not at any rate be delayed much longer; and if works were already translated from the Syriac for the use of the Greeks, as they were by the friends of Bardesanes, they must naturally have been preceded by translations from the Greek and Syriac which roused and animated the national literature. At a time, too, when controversial and polemic treatises written in the language of the country, like those of Bardesanes against Marcion and other heretics, were received with applause and read with interest, the nation must certainly have possessed the Bible in its own language, in order to take an interest in, or even to understand, the controversy and the arguments.

We must therefore have good grounds for supposing peculiar impediments which stood in the way of a version of the New Testament, in order to believe that there was not one made in Mesopotamia, at least as early as about the close of the second century. To such a conclusion we are also led by the observations which we made not long ago upon the character of the text which is the basis of the Peschito. These point us with certainty to the commencement of the third century, and indeed would warrant a step further, into the second century, if we should find occasion for it.

<sup>1</sup> Euseb. de Præp. Evang. L. VI. c. 10.

<sup>2</sup> Euseb. H. E. L. IV. c. 28. *Βαρδησάνης ἰκανώτατός τις ἀνὴρ, ἐν τῇ τῶν Σίρων φωνῇ διαλεκτικώτατος, πρὸς τοὺς κατὰ Μαρκίωνα καὶ τινὰς ἑτέρους διαφόρων προΐσταμένους δογμάτων, διαλόγους συστησάμενος τῇ οικείᾳ παραδεδωκε γλῶττη τε καὶ γραφῇ μετὰ καὶ πλείστον αὐτοῦ συγγραμμάτων, οὓς καὶ οἱ γνώριμοι, πλείστοι δὲ ἦσαν αὐτῷ δυνατοῦς τῷ λόγῳ παρισταμένοι, ἐπὶ τὴν Ἑλλάνων ἀπὸ τῆς Σίρων μεταβέβληκας φωνῆς. Ἐν οἷς ἐστὶ καὶ ὁ πρὸς Ἀντωνίνον ἰκανώτατος αὐτοῦ περὶ ἐμπαρμένης διάλογος. Ὅσα τε ἄλλα φασὶν αὐτὸν προφάσει τοῦ τότε διωγμοῦ συγγράψαι κ. τ. λ. Comp. Theodoret. Hæret. Fab. L. I. c. 22.*

<sup>3</sup> De Script. Eccles. V. Bardesanes.

<sup>4</sup> Theodoret, Hist. Eccles. L. IV. c. 29. Hæret. Fab. L. I. c. 22. Sozomen. H. E. L. III. c. 16. Assemani Biblioth. Orient. T. I. p. 48.



The language of a writer in the last half of the second century, who speaks of Syriac Gospels, here deserves attention. We mean Hege-sippus, respecting whose works Eusebius makes the following observation: "He quotes *from the Gospel according to the Hebrews and the Syriac*, particularly also from the Hebrew," thus giving us to understand that he was a convert from Judaism: ἐκ τῆ τοῦ καθ' Ἑβραίους εὐαγγελίου καὶ τοῦ Συριακοῦ καὶ ἰδίως ἐκ τῆς Ἑβραϊδος διαλέκτου τινα τί-θησι<sup>5</sup>.

*From the Gospel of the Hebrews and the Syriac?* Does he mean to connect these together as one work, or to separate them as two different works? He might have connected them; for the Gospel of the Hebrews, which was probably written in the Galilean dialect, might properly be called a Syriac Gospel. But then he would have used another form of expression; he would have said: ἐκ τοῦ Συριακοῦ καθ' Ἑβραίους εὐαγγελίου, or τοῦ καθ' Ἑβραίους εὐαγγελίου, τοῦ Συριακοῦ, *from the Gospel of the Hebrews in Syriac*.

In the present case: *the Gospel of the Hebrews and the Syriac*—the *and* distinguishes two things, a Gospel of the Hebrews—and—a Syriac i. e.—Gospel. If *the Syriac* were merely an epithet of the first, the *and* could not have been placed between them, but *Syriac*, according to both Greek and Latin construction, must have been placed before or immediately after: *in Syriaco Evangelio secundum Hebraeos*—or *in Evangelio secundum Hebraeos, Syriaco*—in the Syriac Gospel of the Hebrews—in the Gospel of the Hebrews, the Syriac—in the version of Ulfilas, the Gothic—in the Gothic version of Ulfilas. But if I say: in the version of Ulfilas and the Gothic, I express myself as if speaking of two things which are to be distinguished. In short, grammar does not connect a single adjective with its noun by *and*. It is only when several adjectives are used together that a second or third is connected in this way with the first.

If therefore the expression of Eusebius may be judged by the rules of grammar, and particularly that of the language in which he writes, he speaks of a Gospel of the Hebrew and of a Syriac Gospel, which last must have been only a translation.

### § 69.

So much respecting the name, source, materials, and condition of the text of this version, as also respecting its antiquity. We have now to enumerate the editions of it which have appeared.

When in 1552, Ignatius, Patriarch of Antioch, sent Moses of Merdin as a deputy to Rome to Julius 3d, to represent there his religious tenets, he at the same time enjoined it upon him to cause the Syriac New Testament to be printed in Europe. His endeavor to perform this injunction proving unavailing at Rome and Venice, Moses applied to Albert Widmanstad, the Austrian Chancellor under Ferdinand I. Widmanstad had long applied himself to the Syriac language, and his earnest intervention prevailed upon the king to defray the expenses of the work<sup>2</sup> He with Moses, corrected the text from two MSS. and

<sup>1</sup> Euseb. H. E. L. IV. c. 22.

<sup>2</sup> See Assmanni Bibl. Or. T. I. p. 535. Comp. also Andreae Mulleri Criciffenhagii Opuscula. Nr. VIII. and IX.

directed the printing of this beautiful and scarce volume, which, besides a Syriac title of six lines in Estrangelo, has also the following in Latin: "*Liber Sacrosancti Evangelii de Jesu Christo Domino et Deo nostro. Reliqua hoc codice comprehensa pagina proxima indicabit. Div. Ferdinandi Rom. Imperatoris designati jussu et liberalitate, characteribus et lingua Syra, Jesu Christo vernacula, divino ipsius ore consecrata, et a Joh. Evangelista Hebraica dicta, scriptorio prelo diligenter expressa.*" Here follows a Syriac line and then under it: "*Principium Sapientie timor Domini.*"<sup>1</sup>

The Acts, the Pauline Epistles, and the Catholic, have their peculiar title; and the pages of each of these three divisions are numbered separately. In the Epistles of Paul the numbers are in Roman characters. The dedications are all dated MDLV; and we see from the statement made after the letter to Gienger and Jacob Jonas on the last page but one, that the work was really completed in that year: "*In urbe Vienna amplissimarum orientalis Austriæ provinciarum metropoli florentissima, ad hunc exitum perductum est divinum hoc opus, Anno a Christi nativitate M. D. LV. XXVII. Septembris. Regiis impensis. Caspar Craphtus Elwangensis, Suevus characteres Syros ex noriei ferri acie sculpebat.—Michael Cymbermannus prelo et operis suis excudebat.*"

In this edition, the second Epistle of Peter, the second and third of John, that of Jude, and the Apocalypse are wanting; also the story of the adulteress and the passage, 1 John. 5: 7. Adler has remarked that it was based upon Nestorian MSS.<sup>2</sup>

2. The second edition was the following: '*Ἡ καινὴ διαθήκη, Testamentum Novum, כְּתִיבָא דְּתַנְכְּנִין. Est autem interpretatio Syriaca N. T. Hebræis typis descripta, plerisque etiam locis emendata. Eadem Latine sermone reddita. Auctore Immanuele Tremelio Theol. doctore et professore in schola Heidelbergensi, cujus etiam grammatica Chaldaica et Syra calci operis adjecta est. Excudebat Henr. Stephanus Anno MDLXIX.* This book contains the Greek text with Beza's translations and the Syriac in Hebrew characters, with a new Latin version. The basis of it is Widmanstad's edition, which Tremelius amended in some places from a Heidelberg MS. Hirt has described its external characteristics;<sup>3</sup> and Bruns has examined the amendments which Tre-

<sup>1</sup> There is a full and accurate description of this book in Hirt's *Oriental. und exegetischer Bibliothek*, II. Th. p. 260. seq. IV Th. p. 317. V Th. p. 25. In my copy the Acts come immediately after the Gospels; and the dedication No. 5. *Ad Div. Ferdinandum*, which is promised in the table of contents is wanting. The dedication: *Ad D. Maximilianum*, is found prefixed to the Epistles of Paul; but I miss again the dedication of the Cath. Epistles: *Ad D. Carolum Austriaci nominis secundum*. The arms of the printer from whose press the work issued, upon the reverse of the title page, together with the words beneath: *cum Rom. Cas. Maj. gratia et privilegio cautum est, ut nemo deinceps hoc opus imprimat. Vienna Austriæ excudebat Michael Zymmermann Anno M. D. L. XII.* are not in mine and not in many other copies, and were first added, it would seem, by the printer when the Royal Chamber delivered him the remaining copies for sale. Hirt's *Orient. Bibliothek*, II. Th. p. 287. IV. Th. p. 339.

<sup>2</sup> Nov. Test. Vers. Syr. denuo examinatæ, p. 39. 40.

<sup>3</sup> Hirt's *Orient. Biblioth.* II. Th. p. 289. As the dedication to queen Elizabeth is subscribed at "Heidelberg 1563," some have supposed that there was an earlier edition at Heidelberg of this date; as if the dedication must not have been written before it could be printed.

melius made in the text and the hasty alterations with which he is chargeable, in, Matt. 10: 8, 27: 35, Luke 22: 17, 18, and Acts 25: 24.<sup>1</sup>

3. The third edition was that printed twice in the 5th vol. of the Antwerp Polyglot, once in Syriac and once in Hebrew characters.—The Latin version was made by Guy Le Fevre De la Boderie. In this edition a MS. was used which Postel brought from the East, according to the Preface to the Latin version of De la Boderie. This MS. was probably *Codex Coloniensis*<sup>2</sup> the various readings of which were collected by Rapheleng and subjoined to the two following editions.

4. This was a Syriac New Testament in Hebrew characters, without any title-page, in octavo. It is sometimes found bound up with the Hebrew Bible issued from the Plantinian press in 1573-74. At the end there are "*Variae lectiones ex N. T. Syriaci MS. Codice Coloniensi nuper a Fr. Rapheleng collectæ.*" Instead of a title-page, immediately over the Gospel of Matthew are the words: ܕܝܗܝܟܐܢ ܩܕܝܫܐ.

5. *Novum Domini nostri Jesu Christi Testamentum Syriace. Antwerpiae ex officina Christophori Plantini, Architypographi regii MDLXXV*, in 16 mo. in Hebrew characters. "*Variae lectiones ex N. T. Syriaci (sic) manuscripto codice Coloniensi, nuper a Fr. Raph. collectae,*" are subjoined as an appendix. Both the Plantin editions appear to be only a reprint from the Antwerp Polyglott.

6. *Novum Testamentum, ܕܝܗܝܟܐܢ ܩܕܝܫܐ, ܗܝ ܕܐܝܬܐ ܕܝܗܝܟܐܢ, Novum Jesu Christi D. N. Testamentum ad Christianissimum Galliae et Poloniae regem Henricum III. Potentiss. et Invictiss. Principem Christianae religionis vindicem et assertorem unicum. Parisiis MDLXXXIII. apud Joannem Benenatum.* 4to. According to Richard Simon the text of De la Boderie is given in this edition, and it belongs among the reprints of the Antwerp Polyglot, unless that learned man made some corrections in the text.

7. Elias Hutter's text in his *Opus duodecim linguarum*, 1599, is useless to the critic.

8. *Novum Domini nostri Jesu Christi Testamentum Syriace cum versione Latina, ex diversis editionibus diligentissime recensitum. Accesserunt in fine notationes variantis lectionis ex quinque impressis editionibus diligenter collectae a Martino Trostio 1621. Cothenis Anhaltinorum, 4to.* Some copies have the year 1622. Mine has the peculiarity of having been ended a year sooner than it was begun; for the subscription at the end is. "*Finitum Cothenis Anhaltinorum XXVI. Septembris Anno Christi MDCXXI*, while the year 1622 is on the title page. The book is well executed; the Syriac type is excellent; the editions made use of, as named in the list of various readings, were *Edit. Viennens. Tremell. Guido (Fabric. de la Boderie,)* i. e. the text of the Antwerp Polyglot, *Parisiense exemplar ann. 1584, N. T. Syriac. Plantini*, in 8vo.

9. The Syriac text in the 9th and 10th volumes of the Paris Polyglot was taken from the Antwerp Polyglot, as Vitré asserts in Le Long; but Gabriel Sionita undertook some alterations in it, it is not known

<sup>1</sup> Bruns in Repertor. für bibl. und morgenl. Litteratur, XV. Th. p. 153, seq.

<sup>2</sup> Herbert Marsh's Notes and Additions to Michaelis' Introd. p. 142, Vol. 1.









the Peschito." The words in Acts 8: 37, εἶπε ὁ Φίλιππος . . . Χριστόν, and in Acts 15: 34, ἔδοξε τῷ Σίλα ἐπιμεῖναι αὐτοῦ, are put in the lower margin, as also, 18: 6, τὸ αἷμα ὑμῶν ἐπὶ τῇν κεφαλῇν, with the remark: "These words are found in Greek MSS." So likewise Acts 28: 29, is noted in the lower margin. The celebrated passage 1 John 5: 7, is wanting. There is a small note pasted at the end of the book which informs us that: "*Brevi prodibunt codicum MSS. collationes, ad quorum fidem emendata est hæc editio.*" I do not know whether or when these appeared. Probably the Syriac MSS. which Dr. Buchanan brought with him from the East Indies and presented to the Cambridge University,<sup>1</sup> were the basis of the text. Among them are some Nestorian MSS., as may be inferred from 1 Cor. 5: 8. In the lower margin is the readings ܐܡܢܐ, with the addition: "*This is found in some copies.*" Adler found it in MSS. which according to the inscription were Nestorian (*Nov. Test. Version. Syr. L. I. p. 36*), and the Nestorians are accustomed to use leavened bread in the administration of the Lord's supper. (*Asseman. Bibl. Or. T. III. P. II. Dissert. de Syris Nestorianis, § XII.*) Another reading of Heb. 2: 9, χωρὶς θροῦ, which is regarded as Nestorian, the editor does not seem to have met with in his MS. Besides the Nestorian, Jacobite MSS. were likewise used. There is an evidence of this in Acts 20: 28, where all the MSS. of the Peschito hitherto known read, *Church of the Messiah*; but the editor adopted in his text ܕܡܫܝܚܐ, with the note in the margin beneath: "in other copies of the *Messiah* is read here." The reading adopted was, according to Sabariesu's testimony, the usual one in the MSS. of the Jacobites (*Assem. Bib. Or. T. III. in Append. ad catalog. Ebed Jesu. C. XXXIX*); and is found also in the Philoxenian version. It has in fact some correspondence with the monophysite union of the two natures, in such a manner that the divine merged in the human as in the ocean; on which account God performed human actions, slept, wept, and redeemed his people with his blood.

The existing editions, therefore, are derived from the MSS. of three different churches, the Nestorians, Eutychians and Maronites. Each of these gave the preference to this or that reading; but neither possessed a peculiar Recension of the text. We draw this conclusion in regard to the Eutychians, because if there had been any remarkable peculiarities in the monophysite text, the Bible-Society edition would at least have presented them in the lower margin.

We have been lately reminded anew with what caution we are to make use of this version, for purposes of criticism. Some of the admonitions are general and hold in regard to every version; such as that we must pay regard to the construction of the language, and the peculiar manner of the translator. Every version, obeying the laws of construction peculiar to its own language, deviates in little points from the Greek, without making it necessary to suppose a peculiar reading at bottom; every version has certain habits which can be learned only by

<sup>1</sup> Latest Researches into the present condition of Christianity in India, by Dr. C. Buchanan, translated by Chr. Gottl. Blumhardt. Stuttgart. 1813. p. 139 -43.

long acquaintance. Among the peculiarities of the Peschito are these, e. g. it always subjoins ἡμῶν to κύριος; 2d, instead of αὐτός, αὐτοῦ, the proper name to which it refers is usually repeated; 3d, it omits small parts of speech such as εἶτα, τότε, ἰδοὺ, and verbs which are superfluous, as λέγων, ἀποκριθεὶς; 4th, πᾶς is often arbitrarily inserted and omitted; and 5th, adverbs of comparison, such as ὡς, ὁμοίως, are often omitted.<sup>1</sup>

## PHILOXENIAN VERSION.

## § 70.

The MSS. of this version contain a postscript at the end of the Gospels, which informs us respecting the time at which it was composed and some other historical circumstances relative to it. The postscripts in all the MSS., so far as they have been carefully examined, agree, and only contain in the different MSS. a clause or two more or less. So far they agree; literally: *This MS. of the four Evangelists was first translated from the Greek into the Syriac, with great pains, at Mabug, in the year of Alexander 819, in the days of the holy confessor Philoxenus, Bishop of that place. It was afterwards collated with great care by me, poor Thomas, with two (some MSS. read three) very excellent and correct copies, in the Antonia at Alexandria, the great city, in the holy monastery of the Antonians. It was written and collated the second time, at the place mentioned, in the year 927 of Alexander, in the fourth Indiction.*<sup>2</sup>

The version was made, then, in the days of Philoxenus, in 508 of the Christian era. This Philoxenus, or Xenaias, was bishop of Mabug, Manbej, Mangeb or Hierapolis in Syria, from 488 to 518.<sup>3</sup> The author of the version is not named in the above inscription; but another Syriac writer has preserved it. According to him, it was Polycarp, a *Chorepiscopus* of Philoxenus. He undertook the work and dedicated it to Philoxenus, who incited him to it, and from whom the version received its name.<sup>4</sup> It was made from the Greek, and comprehended the whole New Testament.

## § 71.

Philoxenus, also called Xenaias, was a favorite of Peter Gnaphey, who got himself into the patriarchate of Antioch, and contrived to main-

<sup>1</sup> Geo. Benedict. Winer. *Comment. de Vers. N. T. Syr. usu critico caute instituendo.* (The Christmas Programm.) Erlang. 1823. 4to.

<sup>2</sup> *Versio Syriaca Philoxen.* Ed. Jos. White, at the end of John and in the critical notes, p. 641. Adler, *N. T. versiones Syriacæ—denovo examinate.* Hafniæ 1789, 4to. L. II. p. 45, 48. *Repertor. für bibl. und morgenl. Litteratur*, VII Th. p. 234 seq. VIII Th. p. 89, 90. Storr *Observationes super versionibus No. Test. Syriac.* Pars. II. § 19. p. 45.

<sup>3</sup> Assemani *Biblioth. Orient.* T. II. p. 10-46.

<sup>4</sup> Moses Aghelæus apud Asseman. *Bib. Or.* T. II. p. 83. Adler, loc. cit. 48.

tain himself in this elevated station by means of the connexions he had, and the creatures he gathered around him. Among the latter was Philoxenus, whom he consecrated Bishop of Mabug, and used as a tool. The patriarch was attached to the doctrines of Eutyches, and, as he seemed to entertain a mitigated view of the Monophysite doctrine, a great part of Syria fell in with his opinions. He indeed found opponents, for no such change takes place, in general, without much disturbance; but the court of Constantinople seemed to favor him and his tenets so much, that when the Emperor Zeno promulged a scheme of union, or *Henotikon*, the Monophysites received it with approbation, and the patriarch with Philoxenus and his party, and Peter Mongus, patriarch of Alexandria, subscribed it. From this time they constituted a peculiar sect by themselves, attached to the new doctrines.<sup>1</sup> Hence, it would seem, they came to a resolution to execute a church-version of their own, which I suppose they made from Origen's copies, in order to invest its text with as high authority as possible.

### § 72.

One hundred and eight years afterwards, viz. in the year 927 of the Greeks, or 616 according to our reckoning, poor Thomas, as the postscript to the Gospels says, revised this Monophysite document and collated it with two, or as some copies say three, ancient MSS. in the monastery of the Antonians at Alexandria.

The Acts and Catholic Epistles he collated, as the subscription to them informs us, with one Greek MS. The Pauline Epistles, however, he appears to have collated with two; for two are cited in the margin. E. g. at Philip. 3: 20, Ephes. 2: 16, Rom. 8: 27.

Several copies of this version, in the subscriptions added by the copyists, term this poor Thomas, Thomas of Charkel; e. g. the Parisian Codex: "Thus ends, by God's help, the holy book of the preaching of the adorable Christ, our God, according to the four Evangelists, from the Charkelian emendation, etc." and under the table of Chapters in Matthew: "The chapters of Matthew, seventy in number, according to the correction and amendment of Thomas of Charkel, are finished." Other MSS. have several other subscriptions of this nature.<sup>2</sup>

There has not been, however, so much perplexity as to the person of Thomas, as in regard to another circumstance respecting his labors. He says, in the postscript to the Gospels: "It was afterwards with great pains collated by me, poor Thomas. . . . for the second time it was written and collated in the place mentioned, etc." From these words some infer two collations of it, the first by Thomas, and the second by some unknown individual in the year of Alexander 927.

Yet it is nothing unusual to collate a MS. twice, nor was it with the ancients. Thomas may have done this. The collation of 927 is evidently the work of Thomas of Charkel. So we are told by Bar-Hebræus in his *Chronicon Syriacum*. At the same time (says he, *ad Ann.* 927 of the Seleucidan era) lived Thomas of Charkel, a monk of the

<sup>1</sup> Asseman. Bib. Or. T. II. p. 10-46. Evagrius H. E. L. III. c. 31. 52.

<sup>2</sup> *Versio Syr. Philox. Præfat. J. White*, Sect. IV. *Adler Vers. N. T. Syr. denuo examinata*, L. II. p. 56, 58, 59, 63, 66, &c.



monastery of Tarill, who in his youth applied himself to Greek literature in the monastery of Kenserin, and was subsequently Bishop of Mabug. When he was deprived of his station by Domitian, Bishop of Melito, he went to Egypt and lived in the Antonia at Alexandria, in the holy monastery of the Antonians, where with great industry he amended the four Gospels and the other books of the New Testament, by a careful and accurate revision of the version which had been made before him at Mabug by Philoxenus." So far Bar-Hebræus.<sup>1</sup>

Thomas was, therefore, a contemporary of Paul of Tela, who in the same place composed a Syriac version of the Old Testament from the Hexaplar text of Origen. From this circumstance, I can explain to my satisfaction the undertaking of Thomas of Charkel, which at first view appears rather singular.

### § 73.

Thomas saw that the Hexaplar text, from which Paul made his version, was accompanied throughout in the margin with the readings of Aquila, Theodotion and Symmachus. The New Testament version of his sect, it seemed to him, needed something of this kind and the library of the Antonians offered him MSS. which were distinguished above others for ancient and remarkable readings. These materials he thought he could employ in a similar way; for the advantage which had been derived in the Old Testament from the MSS. of Aquila and others, was offered him in respect to the New by the MSS. of the Antonians, which contained as many and far more important various readings, with which he could store his margin. The text of the old Syriac version supplied the place of the Hebrew text in the Old Testament. And, as in the Old Testament exegetical notes were scattered here and there in the margin, he wished to present some likewise; and whatever learning of this nature it was in his power to add, he did.

The readings which he presents in the margin occur in the MSS. *B. C.*, and they are generally such as are handed down to us in *D.* from the time of the corrupted text; as likewise in the Sahidic version and the Latin versions antecedent to Jerome. In the Acts in particular we are presented with considerable deviations and corruptions in the text, which often agree with *D* and *E*, but are sometimes more extravagant than either. (Comp. Acts 13: 33. 14: 4, 5. 14: 10. 15: 1. 16: 17. etc.)

### § 74.

Now had he been content with merely noting in the margin the peculiarities which he found in his ancient MSS., his labors would merit our hearty thanks; but he was not so cautious and unpretending. He was desirous of playing the critic himself, and sometimes introduced his readings into the text, making use of obelisks and asterisks, according to the example of the Hexaplar which his companion had translated into Syriac. Thus he withdrew in many places the original reading of

<sup>1</sup> *Asseman. Bib. Or. P. II. p. 334.* Eichhorn in the *Repert. für bibl. und morgenl. Litteratur*, VII. Th. p. 234. seq.—Bruns in the same *Rep. VIII. Th. p. 89, 90.* Probably the passage is from the 2d vol., yet unprinted, which contains the history of the Patriarchs of Antioch.

the Philoxenian version, whose text was probably of more value than all the critical additions with which he intended to adorn it.

Yet we must not think that he was the first to introduce obelisks and asterisks into the Philoxenian version; they existed in it earlier, and indeed originally. Chance has preserved a MS. of this version, which has neither Thomas' subscription, nor the various readings in the margin which he collated from ancient copies, nor the notes which he added from his own learning. This Codex (*Mediceo-Florentin. Plut. I. n. XL.*) is consequently a copy of a MS. of the time antecedent to the labors of Thomas;<sup>1</sup> and is of no ordinary value in enabling us to distinguish from Polycarp's version the interpolations introduced by him.

Now as this Codex, likewise, is furnished with obelisks and asterisks, it is clear that their use was as early as the time of Polycarp, the author of the version. He either added them himself, with a view to correct certain passages in the text by them, or he selected for his version a text which was already in repute and estimation for its accuracy. In the latter case we must suppose him to have used the text of Origen, who made use of the usual Alexandrian signs, obelisks, and asterisks, in performing his critical labors. Should we discover a family of MSS. which exhibited this text, we should then be sure that Polycarp did not form his own text, but selected an existing Recension and executed his version according to it. Our conclusion as to whether Origen's text was used or not would then be almost undoubting.

### § 75.

Thomas, as we have said, did not content himself with presenting his readings and observations in the margin, but had an unfortunate inclination to undertake critical amendments of the text. This is shown in Mark 11: 10, where, after *πατρός ἡμῶν Δαβίδ*, he inserted *εἰρήνη καὶ δόξα ἐν ὕψιστοις*, and says in the margin: "*This is not found in all the Greek MSS., nor indeed in the text of Mar Xenaïas, but it is in some which we regard as very good copies.*" The passage was thus undeniably not in the Philoxenian text, and was first introduced by our critic. His interpolations are manifest from the readings; for they are such as occur only in MSS. of the corrupted Alexandrian text, as were the MSS. of the Antonians. E. g. in Luke 19: 45, after *ἀγοράζοντας* there is inserted with an asterisk, *καὶ τὰς τραπέζας τῶν κολλυβιστῶν ἐξέχεεν, καὶ τὰς καθέδρας τῶν πωλούντων τὰς περιστεράς*, which appears only in D of all the Greek MSS. In the margin he informs us: "*The words do not occur in all the Greek MSS.*" Who can help seeing that the words which he inserts with an asterisk, after *ὃν τρόπον καὶ οἱ ἄγγελοι*, in Acts 15: 11, were derived from an unregulated text, particularly as we find this addition in Codex D. The words are: *συγκατατεθεμένουν δὲ τῶν πρεσβυτέρων τοῖς ὑπὸ τοῦ Πέτρου εὐρημένοις, ἐσίγησεν.*

Other amendments (as he thought them) he took from the Peschito. In Matt. 25: 1, D and the Peschito, after *τοῦ νυμφίου*, add *καὶ τῆς νύμφης*. In the Philoxenian text the addition appears with an asterisk and

<sup>1</sup> Adler, *Vers. N. T. Syr. denuo examinata* L. II. p. 52-55.

with the marginal note: "*This is not found in all the MSS.; e. g. not in the Alexandrian.*"<sup>1</sup> He could therefore have borrowed it only from the Peschito. The reading τὸ πῶρ\* αὐτῶν in Mark 9: 48, has been found in no MS. as yet; the Peschito alone has αὐτῶν. Whence but from this, then, can it have come? After διώκεις in Acts 9: 5, he inserts with an asterisk the words: σκληρόν σοι πρὸς κέντρα λακτίζειν; in the margin he says: "*These words do not occur in the Greek here, but only where Paul narrates the incident himself.*" Though they are not found in the Greek, they are found literally in the Peschito, which is therefore the source of the addition.

In order to distinguish what belongs to each, and to restore the original text of Polycarp, we must especially consult and collate the Medicean Codex before mentioned.

## § 76.

Yet the corruption caused by Thomas in particular passages is not so extensive, as to prevent us from forming a general idea of Polycarp's text. In the first place, as it respects the Gospels, we observe that in the important readings which we have pointed out (§ 38) as peculiar to the text of Lucian compared with the Egyptian MSS., (Matt. 6: 13, 20: 22, Mark 6: 11, 8: 14, Luke 4: 18, 10: 22, John 1: 27, 5: 16. 6: 22, and 69,) they agree perfectly with Lucian. But in the less important readings they often deviate from Lucian's text and approximate to the Egyptian, particularly when the MSS. AKM, 42, 114, 116, and Matth. 10, coincide with the Egyptian MSS. Yet, even in peculiarities in which the MSS. AKM etc. stand entirely alone, the text of Polycarp is often on their side; of which fact we have already (§ 39) given examples.

In Acts 20: 28, occurs one of the most remarkable readings which distinguish Lucian's and the Egyptian MSS. The former read τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ κυρίου καὶ θεοῦ, but the Egyptian MSS. AC, 40, *Vat.* 367, DE, *Copt.*, and *Sahid.*, κυρίου only. B, however, differs from these, and reads θεοῦ, in which it is accompanied by some MSS. This third reading is the one which Polycarp has in his text. Every where else he constantly adheres, sometimes to the Egyptian, and sometimes to Lucian's side. We will present an example of this in Acts X. The letter *p* denotes the agreement of Polycarp, or if it be preferred, of the Philoxenian text, with the readings to which it is prefixed.

p. 2. ποιῶν ἔλεημ. . .	ABC. 40. E. Copt. Sah.	ποιῶν τε ἔλεημ. . .
p. 5. ἄνδρας εἰς Ἰόππην	AB. l. E. Copt. Sah.	εἰς Ἰόππην ἄνδρας
Σίμωνά τινα		p. Σίμωνα τόν
ὃς ἐπικαλεῖται	AB. l. Copt.	ἐπικαλούμενον
7. λαλῶν αὐτῷ	ABC. l. 40. 367.	p. λαλῶν τῷ Κορνηλίῳ
οἰκετῶν	ABC. 40.	p. οἰκετῶν αὐτοῦ
10. αὐτῶν ἐγένετο	ABC. l. 40. Copt.	p. ἐκείνων ἐπέπεσεν
p. 11. καταβαῖνον	ABC. l. 40. E. Sah.	καταβαῖνον ἐπ' αὐτόν

<sup>1</sup> According to one reading "*the Alexandrian*" is in the plural; according to another, in the singular.

11. ἀρχαῖς καθιέμενον	ABC. 40. E.	{	p. ἀρχαῖς δεδεμένον καὶ καθιέμενον	
12. τετράποδα καὶ ἐρ- πετὰ τῆς γῆς	{	ABC. 1. 40. Copt. Sah.	{	p. τετράποδα τῆς γῆς καὶ τὰ θηρία καὶ τὰ ἐρπετὰ ἢ ἀκάθαρτον
p. 14. καὶ ἀκάθαρτον	AB. 1. Sah.			p. καὶ πάλιν
16. καὶ εὐθύς	ABC. 40. E. Copt.			
p. 23. ἐπαύριον ἀναστάς } without ὁ Πέτρος }	AB. 40. D. Copt.			p. ὁ Πέτρος
p. 24. τῇ δὲ ἐπαύρ . . .	ABC. 40. 1. DE. Copt. Sah.			καὶ τῇ ἐπαύρ . . .
p. 26. ἤγειρεν αὐτόν	ABC. 40. 1. DE. Copt. Sah.			αὐτόν ἤγειρε
30. ἤμην καὶ τὴν ἐννάτην	ABC. Copt. ABC. 40. 1. D.			p. ἤμην νηστεύων καὶ p. τὴν ἐννάτην ὥραν
p. 33. ὑπὸ τοῦ κυρίου	ABC. 40. Copt.			ὑπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ
p. 34. στόμα αὐτοῦ	ABC. E. Copt. Sah.			στόμα
36. τὸν λόγον ἀπέστειλε	ABC. Copt. Sah.			p. τὸν λόγον ὃν ἀπέστειλε
p. 47. δύναται κωλύσαι	ABC. 40. 1. Copt. Sah.			κωλύσαι δύναται
p. 48. ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ βαπτισθῆναι	{ AB. 40. 1. Copt. Sah.		{	βαπτισθῆναι ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι κυρίου.

It appears to me that Polycarp did not adhere so much to Egyptian readings in the Pauline Epistles, as in the Catholic, and in the Acts. For an exemplification of this I select Galat. Chap. III. and IV.

## CHAPTER III.

1. ἐβάσκανε . . . οἷς	ABC. 17. Copt.	{	p. ἐβάσκανε τῇ ἀληθείᾳ μὴ πείθεσθαι, οἷς
προεγρ . . . ἐσταυ- ρωμένος	ABC. 17. Copt.		{
p. 10. ὅτι ἐπικατάρατος		ABC. 17. Copt.	
p. 12. ποιήσας αὐτά	ABC. 17. Copt.	{	ποιήσας αὐτά ἄνθρω- πος
13. ὅτι γέγραπται	AB. 17.		{
17. Θεοῦ ὁ	ABC. 17. Copt.	{	
p. τετρακόσια καὶ τριάκοντα ἔτη	ABC. Copt.		{

## CHAPTER IV.

6. καρδ . . . ἡμῶν	A C. Copt.		p. καρδ . . . ὑμῶν
7. διὰ Θεοῦ	AB. 17. Copt.		p. Θεοῦ διὰ Χριστοῦ
8. φύσει μὴ	ABC. 17. Copt.		p. μὴ φύσει
14. πειρασμόν ὑμῶν	AB. 17. Copt.		p. πειρασμόν μου
15. τοῦ οὖν	ABC. 17. Copt.		p. τίς οὖν
p. 25. δουλεύει γάρ	ABC. 17. Copt.		δουλεύει δέ
26. μήτηρ ἡμῶν	BC. Copt.		p. μήτηρ πάντων ἡμῶν

From the Cath. Ep. we select 1 John, Chap. II.



4. ὅτι ἔγνωκα	AB. Copt.	p. ἔγνωκα
6. αὐτὸς περιπατεῖν	AB.	p. αὐτὸς οὕτω περιπατεῖν
p. 7. ἀγαπητοί	ABC. Copt.	ἀδελφοί
p. ὃν ἠκούσατε	ABC. 17. Copt.	ὃν ἠκούσατε ἀπ' ἀρχῆς
10. οὐκ ἔστιν ἐν αὐτῷ	A C. Copt.	p. ἐν αὐτῷ οὐκ ἔστιν
p. 13. ἔγραψα ὑμῖν παιδ . . .	ABC. Copt.	γράφω ὑμῖν παιδ . . .
15. τοῦ θεοῦ ἐν αὐτῷ	A C. Copt.	p. τοῦ πατρὸς ἐν αὐτῷ
p. 23. ὁ ὁμολογῶν τὸν υἱὸν καὶ τὸν πατέρα ἔχει	ABC. Copt.	
p. 24. ὑμεῖς ὁ	ABC. Copt.	ὑμεῖς οὖν ὁ
27. μένει ἐν ὑμῖν	ABC. Copt.	p. ἐν ὑμῖν μένει
29. ὅτι καὶ πᾶς.	A C.	p. ὅτι πᾶς.

The most perfect copy of this version now known, viz. that of Gloucester Ridley, now in the Library of New College, Oxford, does not contain the Apocalypse. Yet, in my apprehension, we have no reason to complain of the loss, as De Dieu has already published it, with the omission, it is true, of the critical signs. (§ 64) These signs which the MS. contains, the mode of translation so exactly like Polycarp's, the nature of the text which neither adheres to Lucian nor Hesychius, but vibrates from one to the other, are so many evidences of the truth of our supposition.

Of the Gospels, it is true, we have Greek MSS. to which the Philoxenian version inclines; but it is not so in respect to the Acts and the Epistles. But it may be said, that had Polycarp selected Origen's text for translation, it could hardly have been otherwise than that some MSS. of the Acts and Epistles, likewise, according to this Recension, should agree with him; the text of Polycarp in these portions of the New Testament would not have been so entirely unique. The objection which I have here stated against myself, is not unimportant; but its weight is considerably diminished, if we reflect that not so many MSS. by far of the Acts and Epistles have been collated as of the Gospels; and, even of those, the greater part only cursorily and carefully. We need much more information to enable us to pronounce definitely and confidently in regard to this and other critical questions.

### § 77.

The version itself everywhere evinces the most careful and laborious endeavor to lose not a syllable of the original text and to express all the *minutiæ*, even in violation of the laws of the Syriac language. The article *ὁ, ἡ, τό*, is always carefully rendered, as well as *ἐστὶ* and *εἰσὶ*, little as either practice accords with pure Syriac phraseology. *Αὐτός, αὐτή*, does not appear as an affix according to Syriac custom, but is treated as a separate word, by means of the syllable *ܐܘܬܐ*, to which it is attached. Words compounded with *πρό, σύν, ἐπί, κατά*, which are known in none of the Shemitish dialects, are represented in a very artificial manner; as e. g. *πρόθεσις*, ܡܕܢܝܬܐ, *ἐπιγραφή*, ܡܬܬܬܝܒܐ, *ܡܬܬܬܝܒܐ*, in Mark 2: 26. 12: 16. These improprieties, however, which are una-

voidable when a language is so abused, are of uncommon advantage to criticism, as the version seldom leaves us in doubt as to what was in the original, as other versions do whose authors have exercised more freedom.

## § 78.

The four Gospels of this version have been printed in England with the following title: "*Sacrorum Evangeliorum versio Syriaca Philoxeniana, ex codd. MSS. Ridleianis in Biblioth. Coll. Novi Oxoniensis repositis, nunc primum edita, interpretatione et annotationibus Josephi White, A. M. Coll. Wadh. Socii et ling. Arab. Prof. Laudian. Oxonii e typograph. Clarendoniana.*" 1778. 4to. This volume is divided into two parts: *Tom. II.* begins with the Gospel of John. The second volume bears the title: "*Actuum Apostolorum et Epistolarum tam Catholicarum quam Paulinarum, versio Syriaca Philoxeniana ex Codice MS. Ridleiano in Bibl. Coll. Nov. Oxon. reposito nunc primum edita: cum interpretatione et adnotationibus Josephi White. S. T. P. ling. Arab. apud Oxonienses Prof. Tom. I. Acta Apostolorum et Epistolas Catholicas complectens. Oxonii e Typogr. Clarendon. 1799.*" The second part with the same title comprehends the Epistles of Paul. "*Tom. II. Epistolas Paulinas complectens. Oxon. etc. 1803.*" Various learned men have written accounts and descriptions of the MSS. of this version now in existence; and likewise monographs and essays on the condition of the text and its readings.<sup>1</sup> Among them Adler's work which we have frequently cited: "*Nov. Test. versiones Syriacæ etc.*" is of peculiar value. He had White's edition before him and compared it with MSS., thus obtaining the materials and occasion for much valuable critical remark.

## PALÆSTINO-SYRIAC VERSION.

## § 79.

We as yet know of but one MS. of this version; and that contains only lessons from the four Gospels for all the Sundays and festivals of the year. It is in the Vatican Library, N. XIX among the Syriac MSS. J. G. C. Adler obtained it thence and undertook an investigation of it.<sup>2</sup>

The character and language in which it is written differ somewhat

<sup>1</sup> Gloucester Ridley, *De Syriac. N. T. versionum indole atque usu*. Londini 1761. Adler, *N. T. vers. Syriac, Simplex, Philoxeniana, Hierosolymitana—denuo examinatæ*. Hafniæ, 1789. 4to.—Paulus, *Accuratiores manuscriptorum, quibus versio N. T. Philoxeniana continetur, catalogus, cum quibusdam ad viros eruditos quæstionibus*. Helmstadii 1788.—Gottlob. Christ. Storr, *Observationes super N. T. versionibus Syriacis*. Stuttgarti 1772. 8vo. Storr, in the *Repertor. für bibl. und morgenl. Litteratur*, X. Th.

<sup>2</sup> *Nov. Testam. versiones Syriac. Simplex, Philoxeniana et Hierosolymitana denuo examinatæ*. L. III. p. 137. seq.

from the common Syriac. It has many Chaldee idioms, and very much resembles this dialect in its grammatical peculiarities; e. g. in suffixes of the third person to nouns in the plural number, in the *status emphaticus* of nouns, and in the form of the third person masculine of the future tense.

Abulpharagius distinguishes three Syriac dialects—the Syro-Aramaic, which is the most elegant, spoken by the inhabitants of Roha and Haran and external Syria; the Palestinian spoken at Damascus, on the Libanus and in the interior of Syria; and lastly the Chaldæo-Nabathæan, the roughest of all, common in the Assyrian mountains and the villages of Irak.<sup>1</sup>

The manifest resemblance to the Chaldaic observable in our version appears to denote that it is Chaldæo-Nabathæan. The Peschito was probably composed in the region of Edessa, Roha, Haran, etc., and was there, we know, the church-version. Abulpharagius informs us that it was used especially in eastern Syria.<sup>2</sup> From the country where it originated, it appears to have been written in the first and most elegant dialect. The Philoxenian version prevailed in the vicinity of Antioch, and exhibits to us the language of this part of Syria. We have left, therefore, for our version only Damascus and Palestine, or the Syrian mountains and the province of Irak.

To determine our choice between the two, we must not overlook an observation made by the learned man to whom we are principally indebted for our knowledge of this version; viz. that many idioms occur in it which are found only in the Philoxenian version besides. Now as the idioms of both approximate to each other, the countries of their respective origin must likewise.

The part of Syria in which our version originated was evidently a Roman province, or a part of one. I infer this from some words which struck my eye in the specimen (Matt. 27: 3—32,) which Dr. Adler has presented us. The soldiers, in v. 27, are called simply ܠܬܝܡܝܐ, *Romans*; as if no soldiers but Romans were known in the country. In the same verse ܫܬܝܪܐ is rendered by the Roman word ܬܬܡܪܐ, *castrum*; from which we may readily infer to whom the dominion of the country belonged. The Assyrian mountains never had a Roman Prætor, and were not brought *in formam provinciæ*, as was the case with western Syria and Palestine. We must therefore certainly regard this as a Palestinian version, rather than one which originated in the Assyrian mountains. Michaelis, and others after him, even call it the *Hierosolymitan* version.

The MS. itself was written in the vicinity of Palestine at Antioch; where the monks of Palestine, it is very possible, had a monastery. It was written, says the subscription: "*in the monastery of Abbot Moses, in the city of Antioch, in the vicinity of the Holy Land.*" Probably ܡܫܝܚܐ ܕܐܢܬܝܐ should be ܡܫܝܚܐ ܕܐܢܬܝܐ.

#### § 80.

The version was made from the Greek, as is evident from the Greek orthography of proper names (e. g. Ἰησοῦς, Ἰωαννῆς, Καῖσαρος, Ἰαεῖρος,

<sup>1</sup> Hist. Dynast. Dyn. I. p. 16, 17. <sup>2</sup> Dynast. VI. p. 100.

"*Ἀννας, Μεσσία*), and from the many Greek expressions which are retained in the very places which they occupy in the original: *τραπεζῖται* Matt. 25: 27, *ἀντίδικος* Matt. 5: 25, *βουλευτής* Mark 15: 43, *τῶν κεράμων* Luke 5: 19, *καὶ γὰρ* John 5: 23, *μᾶλλον—ἤν γὰρ* John 3: 19, etc.

We cannot determine what was the character of the Greek text which the translator had before him, or with what class of MSS. it coincided, as we have no continuous collation of it. As yet only two or three rare readings have been extracted from each chapter and introduced to public notice. We are acquainted, therefore, with the peculiarities in which it differs from the MSS. of every Recension, without knowing to what MSS. it is in general allied.

Its text however appears sometimes to be compounded from various MSS.; e. g. in Matt. 14: 24, where for *ἤδη μέσον τῆς θαλάσσης* some MSS. and the Peschito read, *σταδίους πολλούς ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς ἄπειχε*, it unites both readings: *σταδ. πολλ. ἀπὸ γῆς ἄπειχε μέσον τῆς θαλάσσης*. So in John 19: 16, 17, instead of *παρέλαβον δὲ τὸν Ι. . .*, the passage is compounded as follows, of different readings in different MSS.: *ἀγάγοντες δὲ τὸν Ἰησοῦν ἐπέθηκαν αὐτῷ τὸν σταυρὸν αὐτοῦ, καὶ βαστάζων ἐξηλθεν . . .*

#### PERSIAN VERSION.

##### § 81.

The Persian version which appeared in the London Polyglot extends only through the Gospels. The language is interspersed with so many Arabic expressions that we cannot fail to recognise the influence which the religion of Mohammed had upon the language of the nation, and consequently refer it to a period later than his time.

The parts of Persia bordering on the north of Mesopotamia made use, it would seem, of the Syriac ritual and church-version; just as our ritual and version are in Latin. In the 5th and 6th centuries, Edessa was much resorted to by the Persians for the purpose of obtaining instruction in the genuine Nestorian tenets at the celebrated school in that place.<sup>1</sup> Now when these portions of Persia came to desire a version in their own language, they had recourse to the Syriac copies, and translated from them. Thus arose the Persian version which we at present have and which was probably composed at Edessa.

##### § 82.

Its source is the Peschito, as is proved by many readings which are now to be found only in it and the Peschito; e. g. Mark 6: 41, *ἐμέρισαν πᾶσι*; 51, *ἐθαύμαζον καὶ ἐξίσταντο*; 7: 2, *κοινᾶς* and *τοῦτ' ἔστιν* are wanting; 20, *ὁ δέ* for *ἔλεγε δέ*; 31, *εἰς τὰ ὄρια* for *ἀνὰ μέσον τῶν ὁρί-*

<sup>1</sup> Theodor. Lector., *ἐκλογαὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ δευτέρου βιβλίου*. Asseman. Biblioth. Or. T. III. c. 2. p. 744.



ων; 34, ὁ ἔστι διανοίχθητι is wanting; 8: 25, καὶ ἐποίησεν αὐτὸν ἀναβλέψαι is wanting; 9: 26, καὶ τὸ δαιμόνιον κράξαν; 29, ἐν νηστείᾳ καὶ προσευχῇ; 10: 19, μὴ κλέψῃς, μὴ φονεύσῃς; 46, Τίμαϊος υἱὸς Τιμαίου; 52, ἠκολούθει ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ. We find so many examples in these few chapters that it is unnecessary to illustrate the matter further.

This is shown also by many mistakes of the translator which clearly sprang from the Syriac. Mark 6: 9, ἀλλ' ὑποδεμένους σανδάλια is translated وڪښن را شپښ دآرنډ, *they should hold shoes*

*in detestation*, which arose from mistaking the word ܠܥܠܡܐ, *to put on*

*shoes*, for ܠܥܠܡܐ, *to hate*, ܠܥܠܡܐ ܠܥܠܡܐ. In Mark 7: 11, ὡρόν

μου ὃ ἐὰν ἐξ ἐμοῦ ὠφεληθῇς, is given in the Peschito ܕܡܝܢ ܕܡܝܢ

ܕܡܝܢ; the first word the Persian translator mistook for

ܕܡܝܢ and rendered *approach to me*. Mark 7: 34, *He looked up*

*to heaven and sighed*, ܕܡܝܢ ܕܡܝܢ: the derivation of this word from

ܕܡܝܢ misled the translator and he rendered, *He looked up to heaven*

*and rested*. He makes the same mistake in Mark 8: 12, where he

translates *and he rested in his spirit*. In Mark 9: 3, οὐ δύναται λευ-

κᾶναι—ܕܡܝܢ ܕܡܝܢ according to the Peschito, he has used one of the

two significations of ܕܡܝܢ, *to see*, in Aphel *to make white*, for the other;

and renders *they could not bear the sight*. The word βασιλικός, in John

4: 49, which the Syriac renders by ܕܡܝܢ ܕܡܝܢ, he even took for a

proper name, and translated thus: *Abdolmelik said to him*.

### § 83.

This version would be of uncommon value in the criticism of the Peschito, had it been preserved without being corrupted, but it is disfigured by many glosses. E. g. in Mark 7: 15, after the words, *those are they which defile a man*, is added, *which is a mortal sin*; in Mark 7: 26, where the Greek woman of Syrophenicia is spoken of, the words *for she was from Hems*, are inserted. Similar additions and explanations are met with in almost every chapter. We find, moreover, words and even sentences twice translated; e. g. Mark 6: 49, where the word

φάντασμα is rendered once by ܕܡܝܢ a *deception*, and immediately af-

terwards by ܕܡܝܢ a *phantom*. Mark 8: 14, *they had only one loaf*

*with them in the ship*, the Peschito translates, *only one cake*; in this it

was followed by the Persian translator, who says first, *one cake*, ܕܡܝܢ,

but translates the word again by *loaf*, ܕܡܝܢ, *not a cake, and no loaf*

*had they with them in the ship*. (Comp. Mark 6: 7. 31. 43.)

Frequently, one of these readings exhibits the Syriac and the other the Greek text, as is the case in the last example; and yet we have no reason to suppose that there was so much knowledge of the Greek language, and so many Greek MSS., in existence in Persia, as to have enabled readers to illustrate and amend their text from the Greek. It is more probable that there existed a Persian version from the Greek, which was made use of by readers and copyists, and from which these interpolations sprang. Indeed, this extensive empire must have had several versions to supply the wants of different provinces in which different dialects were prevalent. If we are not influenced by the advantage which biblical literature would derive from a careful examination of this version, at least the striking and certain similarity of the Persian to our own mother-tongue, the German, should induce us to devote especial pains to the former, for the purpose of inferring from it the original construction of the latter, the roots and former significations of its words, and in order to throw light upon historical facts respecting the origin and migrations of nations.

#### § 84.

Besides the version in the Polyglot, there is still another which has been published by Wheelock, but is little known among us. It is said to have two title-pages, on the first of which is: "*Quatuor Evangelia Domini nostri Jesu Christi Persice, ad numerum situmque verborum Latine data 1652,*" and on the second: "*Quatuor Evangeliorum Domini nostri Jesu Christi versio Persica, Syriacam et Arabicam suavissime redolens; ad verba et mentem Græci textus fideliter et venuste concinnata. Londini. 1657.*"

The editors may indeed have had a MS. containing a version from the Greek, but they employed the Syro-Persian text in making out their own, thus making lamentable confusion. For they used the MS. of Pocock's from which the text in the English Polyglot was printed, as Pierson himself confesses in the preface to Wheelock's Gospels: "*Cum Evangelii Persicis edendis D. Abraham Wheelocus operam navasset, tres sibi MSS. Codices impetraverat, Oxoniensem, Cantabrigiensem, et alterum Pocokianum; quorum uno descripto, ceteris collatis, fusionem in omnes commentarium destinaverat.*"<sup>1</sup> Had they presented us in a state of purity the version made *ad verba et mentem Græci textus*, we would readily have dispensed with the Syriac and Arabic fragrance which they boast upon the title-page.

Lastly, Nadir Shah is said to have caused a Persian version to be composed from Greek, Arabic, Syriac, Armenian and Hebrew MSS., which was published at Ispahan in 1740-41. It can be of little importance to New Testament criticism.

<sup>1</sup> Herbert Marsh's Notes and additions to Michaelis Introd. Vol. I. Germ. Ed. p. 210-11.

## ARMENIAN VERSION.

## § 85.

Our knowledge respecting this version is derived from two sources. The first is an Armenian biography of the saints, in the former Royal Library at Paris, from which the Bishop of Erivan, by request, translated the life of Mesrob into Latin. Richard Simon made use of this.<sup>1</sup> The other is the Armenian History of Moses Chorenensis, which Whiston's sons published, with the title: "*Mosis Chorenensis Historiæ Armeniacæ Libri III. Armeniace ediderunt, Latine verterunt, notisque illustrârunt Guiliclmus et Georgius Guil. Whistoni filii, Aulæ Clarensis in Academiâ Cantabrigiensi aliquamdiu alumni. Londini 1736.*" 4to. Michaelis drew from this fine document. The two authorities do not differ in the main.

## § 86.

The version was contemporary with the national alphabet. The invention of this has immortalized among his countrymen the memory of Mesrob, of Hasekos, in the province of Taran. Till his time they employed the Syriac alphabet, and it would seem that they made use of the Syriac Bible and liturgy in their religious worship. The want of a national character occupied much of his attention; and after many unsuccessful attempts of his own, it was revealed to him, it is said, in a heavenly vision.

He hastened to communicate his new alphabet to king Uram Scavu, and Isaac, the patriarch of the country, who caused schools to be established in Armenia, in which reading and writing were taught. Mesrob himself travelled into Iberia for this purpose.

On his return he found the patriarch employed in translating from the Syriac. There were no Greek MSS. to be had, as Meruzan, a Persian viceroy, had caused all Greek books to be burned; and the Persians in general permitted no other language or character to be used among the Armenians (in the church-service probably,) but the Syriac.<sup>2</sup>

When the Ephesian Synod assembled in 431, two pupils of Mesrob, Joseph and Eznak, were deputed to it, who brought back with them an account of the proceedings of this council, and a carefully written copy of the Bible.

Isaac and Mesrob now threw aside what they had translated from the Syriac, and commenced a version from the newly acquired Greek copy; but they did not possess the requisite knowledge of Greek.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Hist. Crit. des Versions du N. T. Ch. 17. p. 203-205.

<sup>2</sup> Moses Choren. Hist. Arm. L. III. c. 54. R. Simon, H. Crit. des versions du N. T. 17. Chap.

<sup>3</sup> Mos. Chor. L. III. c. 61. The pupils of Mesrob are here called *Johannes Ecclesiensis* and *Josephus Planensis*.

This however did not dishearten them. Joseph and Eznak were despatched to Alexandria to perfect themselves in Greek, and the work was entered upon for the third time, Moses Chorenensis, the historian, himself assisting.<sup>1</sup>

According to Bar Hebræus, Isaac and Mesrob, after the translation from the Greek text was completed, altered it to greater accordance with the Syriac.<sup>2</sup>

The Greeks lay claim to some merit in regard to this version. John Chrysostom is said to have incited and encouraged the Armenians to translate the sacred books, when he was banished to Kukus in Armenia. They began with the Psalter, and then passed to the other canonical books.<sup>3</sup> The banishment of this father from his country actually coincides with the period when the idea of a national character entered the mind of Mesrob; and the influence of the celebrated stranger may explain the revival of his ardent desire of a national character and version. The account of the Armenians, however, and that of the biographer of John Chrysostom do not exactly agree in respect to the book with which a beginning was made; the former naming the Proverbs of Solomon and the latter the Psalms.

### § 87.

The history we have given of the version does not promise a uniform, unmixed text, but rather one made up of various materials—of readings from the old Syriac version, readings furnished by the Ephesian MS., and also readings from Alexandrian MSS. which the pupils of Mesrob would not have failed to bring home with them.

These component parts are easily discoverable in the text. In general it adheres to the Egyptian Recension, but not so closely as not to have adopted readings from MSS. of a period anterior to the introduction of a Recension into Alexandria. It frequently coincides with Codex D in readings peculiar to that MS. alone, or to A and the MSS. which Thomas of Charkel collated in the monastery of the Antonians; e. g. Matt. 15: 32, *ἡμέραι τρεῖς εἰσι, καὶ προσμέν.* . . . 18: 33, *οὐκ ἔδει οὖν καὶ σε.* 19: 10, *ἡ αἰτία τοῦ ἀνδρός.* Mark 2: 9, *τὸν κράββατον, καὶ ὑπάγε εἰς τὸν οἶκόν σου.* 2: 26, *ἔφαγεν, καὶ ἔδωκε καὶ τοῖς σὺν αὐτῷ οὓσι οὓς οὐκ ἔξεστι.* . . . 4: 39, *ἀνέμῳ καὶ τῇ θάλάσσῃ καὶ εἶπε.* 5: 33, *καὶ τρέμουσα ὃ πεποίηκε λάθρα.* 6: 2, *ἐξεπλήσσοντο ἐν τῇ διδαχῇ αὐτοῦ λέγοντες.* 6: 23, *καὶ ὥμοσεν πολλά.* 6: 55, *ἤρξαντο πάντας ἐπὶ, etc.*

In our history of the text we mentioned certain MSS. which are indeed of recent origin, but are transcripts of ancient MSS. of the *κοινή* *ἔκδοσις*, viz. Wetstein 1, 13, 69, and Griesbach 124; the last of which, particularly, contains Asiatic readings, and is allied to the text of the Peschito. (§ 29). With these readings the Armenian version often coincides; and it was these, in part, which got into the version through the

<sup>1</sup> Moses Chor. loc. cit. Rich. Simon, Hist. des vers. loc. cit.

<sup>2</sup> Walton Proleg. XIII. n. 16.

<sup>3</sup> Anonym. Vita Chrysost. c. 113. *Διακλείεσθαι τότε ψαλτήριον καὶ τὴν ἅπασαν διαθήκην πρὸς τὴν ἐκείνων γλώτταν μεταποιήσασθαι.*



Ephesian Codex which the pupils of Mesrob brought back with them. At least it is difficult to refer them to any other source. E. g. Matt. 5: 18, ἀπὸ τοῦ νόμου καὶ τῶν προφητῶν. 13, 124.—7: 27, πτώσις αὐτῆς μεγάλη σφόδρα. 13, 33, 124.—12: 14, οἱ δὲ Φαρισαῖοι ἐξεληθόντες συμβούλιον ἔλαβον κατ' αὐτοῦ. 13, 124.—13: 43, ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τῶν οὐρανῶν, 124.—21: 30, ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν, ὑπάγω κύριε. 13, 69, 124.—23: 10, καθηγηταί· ὅτι καθηγητῆς ὑμῶν ἐστίν. 124.—26: 36, καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς, καθίσαιτε. 69, 124.—Mark 3: 34, περὶ αὐτὸν μαθητὰς καθημένους. 13, 69, 124.—8: 14, καὶ εἰ μὴ ἓνα μόνον ἔχοντες ἄρτον. 1, 13, 69.—8: 15, ζύμης τῶν Ἡρωδιάνων. 1, 13, 69.—8: 17, διαλογίζεσθε ὀλιγόπιστοι. 13, 69, 124.—8: 21, πῶς οὖν οὐπω συνίετε. 69, 124.—10: 11, ἰὰν ἄνηρ ἀπολύσῃ. 1, 13, 69, 124. etc.

Lastly, many readings are taken from the Peschito. Mark 2: 25, ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἔλεγεν. 6: 6, τὰς κώμας διδάσκων. 8: 24, 25, περιπατοῦντας πάλιν ἐπέθ . . . 9: 4, σὺν Μωσεῖ συλλαλοῦντες. 9: 29, νηστεία καὶ προσευχή. 10: 43, γενέσθαι ἐν ὑμῖν μέγας. 12: 33, ἐστὶ τῶν ὀλοκαυτωμάτων. 12: 38, καὶ φιλοῦντων ἀσπασμούς. Luke 2: 49, ὅτι ἐν τῷ οἴκῳ τοῦ πατρὸς. 9: 6, κατὰ κώμας καὶ κατὰ πόλεις. Among these the following, especially, may be reckoned: Matt. 28: 18, καὶ ἐπὶ γῆς· καὶ καθὼς ἀπέσταλκέ με ὁ πατήρ μου, ἀγγεῶ ἀποστέλλω ὑμᾶς.

### § 88.

During the crusades, the rulers of Armenia were closely connected with the inhabitants of the West, and became acquainted with the language used in their churches. They strenuously sought an ecclesiastical union with them, and this was ardently favored by king Haitho, (Abulpharagius calls him **حاتم** in *Hist. Dyn.* 502, but Abulfeda

**هيتوم** T. V. *Ann. Musl.* p. 18,) who afterwards abdicated the government to his son and entered the order of Franciscans. He is even said to have translated from the Latin into Armenian the Prefaces of St. Jerome.<sup>1</sup>

Gregory, Bishop of Sis and Patriarch of the Armenians, proposed to Haitho an ecclesiastical council for this purpose. In his letter to the former king he asserts respecting certain topics of dispute, that it is so in Jerome, in Beda the Presbyter, and other Latin fathers.<sup>2</sup>

Besides what he here says of the Latin fathers and their writings, he appeals to 1 John 5: 7, in the beginning of his letter, in favor of the use of water in mass.<sup>3</sup> To us this is, at any rate, an evidence that preparation for an union had been made by altering the Armenian version here and there according to the Latin.

This same passage was expressly cited again in the Synod which was held at Sis in 1307, which could not have happened unless it was authorized by many copies.<sup>4</sup> This change of the Armenian text in con-

<sup>1</sup> Michaelis' *Introd.* I. Th. § 69, 4th ed.

<sup>2</sup> *Collect. Concil. Labbei et Cossartii edit.* Mansii. T. XXV. p. 145.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.* p. 141.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.* p. 136.

formity with the Latin MSS. can hardly have been the only one; but how far the correctors proceeded can be learned only from a collation of ancient Armenian MSS. with the modern.

### § 89.

The Armenians had several editions of this version printed in the 17th century, as the MS. copies were so expensive that they could not be procured except by the wealthy. By order of a Synod convened in 1662, the Bishop of Erivan, whom we have already mentioned, was despatched to Europe for this purpose by the patriarch. He took up his residence in the monastery of Usci, whence in France he was called *Uscanus*. He had the whole Bible printed at Amsterdam in 1666, and the New Testament alone in 1668, which last was reprinted in 1698. I have myself an edition of the four Gospels of the year 1680, which I find no where mentioned. It is too small for an octavo and too large for a 16mo.; and is embellished with a wood-cut at the beginning of each Gospel. There is prefixed to it what appears to be a catalogue of the chapters or church-lessons. Not understanding a word of it, I cannot state the place where it was printed, which is given in Armenian characters.

The Bishop of Erivan was charged with altering the text of these editions according to the Vulgate, which he was so little desirous of concealing, that he himself freely confesses it in the preface.<sup>1</sup>

There are some later editions, prepared in the monastery of the Armenians at Venice, viz: "*Novum Domini nostri Jesu Christi Testamentum, Armenice editum a Joanne Zohrab, Doctore Armeno, 1789. Venetiis ex typographia monachorum S. Lazari.*" 8vo. The title is Armenian; I have given it in Latin as it was translated to me. The book contains 1 John 5. 7, marked with an asterisk; for, as the Usacan edition contained the verse, the editor, as I was informed by a friend of his, was unwilling to omit it, although it is found in no ancient Armenian MS. This edition was reprinted in the year 1816. A critical edition of the Old and New Testament was prepared in the same monastery, and printed in 1805 in large 4to. About twenty MSS. were made use of, the various readings of which are subjoined in the lower margin. Short scholia, in Armenian, were likewise added in explanation of the text.

## EGYPTIAN VERSIONS.

### § 90.

After the death of Alexander, the Greeks multiplied in Egypt; they surrounded the throne of the Ptolemies, and possessed themselves of the public offices. The language of the court and state officers natu-

<sup>1</sup> Preface general sur le Nouveau Test. des Messrs. Beausobre et L'Enfant. T. I. p. 171.

rally extended itself into Egypt by degrees, first in the vicinity of the court, and then into the remote portions of the country. Yet it could not extirpate the hereditary language of the nation, but the latter was compelled to adopt many Greek words, and to alter its construction according to that of the former. Thus a third sprung from the mixture of the two, which has been called the Coptic language, probably from Coptos, then the capital of Upper Egypt, where, at a distance from court, the ancient language and manners most pertinaciously retained their authority.

After the fall of the Ptolemies, it began again to rear its head and to dislodge from its supremacy a language which had been introduced by foreigners who were now without influence. The Greek, however, obtained in Lower Egypt and in the districts bordering on the northern coast, still longer, it would seem, than in the upper country, on account of the brisk trade and commerce with other nations; and further, because in those parts the Greeks settled in the greatest numbers and for the longest period. In particular, at Alexandria, its prevalence was undisturbed; Greek writers appearing in this city at a very late period.

### § 91.

At what time the Greek became so nearly extinct that versions were required, or how high an authority we may ascribe to these versions, may be accurately determined from the copious investigations of a man of much merit in this department of learning.<sup>1</sup>

Some have asserted that at the Council of Chalcedon in 451, there were Egyptian Bishops who could not even sign their names in Greek, simple as was the form for that purpose. The fact is not exactly so; yet it is remarkable that at least one, Kalosirios, Bishop of Arsinoe, was obliged to do it with the aid of an interpreter.<sup>2</sup> The Archimandrite, Barsuma, was likewise in the same predicament; but he was a Syrian. The additional assertion that, in the great council at Ephesus, certain Egyptians signed their names through an interpreter, is not borne out by the records. It is reasonable to suppose that those Bishops would not have been deputed to it who were least skilled in the language in which the business was transacted. We cannot, therefore, expect so much information on this point from what occurred in foreign countries, as from those which happened in Egypt itself.

We here meet in the outset with Father Pachomius, whose rules for the monks of the Tabennitic monastery were originally composed by him in the Egyptian language, and were subsequently translated into Greek, and also by Jerome into Latin.<sup>3</sup> It has been too hastily inferred from this, that no one in the monastery understood Greek; but so much, certain-

<sup>1</sup> Dr. Friedr. Mûnter, "Über das Alter der Kopt. Uebersetz. des N. T." in Eichhorn's "Allgem. Biblioth. der bibl. Litteratur," IVth. vol. 1st and 3d articles.

<sup>2</sup> Καλοσίριος ἐπίσκοπος Ἀρσινόϊτου, ἐρμηνεύοντος αὐτὸν Ἰουλίου διακόνου αὐτοῦ.

<sup>3</sup> Hieronym. Præf. in Reg. S. Pachomii, § 2. "Urgebant autem missi ad me ob hanc ipsam causam Leontius Presbyter et ceteri cum eo fratres, accito notario; ut erant de Ægyptiacâ in Græcam linguam versâ, nostro sermone dictari."



ly, was implied in this fact, viz : that Pachomius considered the language of the country as the one in which he could make himself understood by all without exception, that he regarded it as the current language of seven thousand monks; for so high does Palladius reckon their number.

Now as Pachomius, in the 139th and 140th section of his rules, requires *all* his pupils to learn to read, and they were so far compelled to it, even against their will, that every one was to be able read at least the New Testament and Psalter, the existence of versions to be read is presupposed. For, from the language he uses in his rules, it is clear that he did not expect them to understand Greek, and yet he requires *of them all* without exception to learn their letters, to receive instruction in reading at certain hours of the day, and to be able to read at least the New Testament and the Psalter.

On one occasion, Father Pachomius sent some of his monastic brethren to Alexandria, to salute the Archbishop of Alexandria, and to purchase some necessaries for the sick. An Alexandrian named Theodore saw them in the Church, and requested them through an interpreter to permit him to accompany them to the Thebaid. They consented. Pachomius kindly received the stranger, and that he might have some one to converse with, gave him for a companion an old man who understood Greek.<sup>1</sup>

Theodore, a different person from the preceding, the favorite pupil of Pachomius, and his successor after his death, caused the letter published by Athanasius at Easter to be translated into Egyptian, for the use of the monastery, that it might serve as a rule for the monks. Whenever he addressed the assembled monks, he appointed an interpreter who repeated his words after him in Greek, for the benefit of the Alexandrians and foreigners who might be unacquainted with the Egyptian language.<sup>2</sup>

An imperial deputy, called *dux Arsenius*, visited the monasteries in Upper Egypt, which were subject to Theodore, in search of a person who, it was suspected, was concealed in one of them. In the monastery of Phebon he assembled the brethren together and questioned them on the subject, through an interpreter. Fortunately there was a foreigner in the monastery, a native of Armenia, who knew Greek, and defended his brethren so ably before this imperial envoy, that he departed without further search.<sup>3</sup>

We meet with another fact of not much later date than this in Lower Egypt, on the Libyan side, in the latter half of the fourth century. Palladius, who travelled at that period through Egypt, as well as other countries, for the purpose of visiting the most celebrated monastic institutions, came to Nitria, where he saw John of Lycopolis, one of the abbots of the desert, and was desirous of conversing with him. But the old man understood so little Greek that he required an interpreter in order to converse with the stranger. Yet it appears from the tenor of their discourse, that John was conversant with the books of the New

<sup>1</sup> Zoega Catalog. Codic. Copticorum MSS. qui in museo Borgiano asservantur, Romæ MDCCCX. Codd. Memphit. n. XLV. p. 76, 77, Copt. 81, Lat.

<sup>2</sup> Zoega Catal. Cod. Memph. XLVI. p. 83. Copt. p. 86. Lat. Comp. Codd. Sahid. n. CLXXVII. p. 371.

<sup>3</sup> Zoega Codd. Memph. XLV. p. 81, 82. Copt. and 85 Lat.



Testament. There must, therefore, have existed in Lower Egypt a version of these books in the language of the country.<sup>1</sup>

One of the founders and most active patrons of the Egyptian monasteries was unacquainted with the Greek language, and was obliged to make use of an interpreter when he was addressed in Greek. We mean Antonius, who had acquired celebrity as early as the time of the Nicene Council. That he was ignorant of Greek, we are informed by Palladius, from the mouth of a man who lived a great while with Antonius, and acted himself as his interpreter.<sup>2</sup>

Isaac, another of his interpreters, is also mentioned by Jerome in his life of Hilarion, the hermit.<sup>3</sup>

As Antonius possessed such extensive repute, he had frequent occasion to edify others by hortatory letters. Jerome praises certain exhortations of this nature, seven in number, which were all composed in the Egyptian language, and afterwards translated into Greek.<sup>4</sup>

They have also been published in a Latin version through the press.<sup>5</sup> An extensive acquaintance with the New Testament, as well as the Old, is evinced in them, although he could have read it only in his native language.

Athanasius, his biographer, who represents himself as one of the pupils of this pious man, says that his first determination in favor of retirement and a contemplative life was occasioned by hearing the Gospel, and particularly the passage Matt. 19: 21, read in the Church; and that he was completely confirmed in it on entering the church the second time while the Gospel was being read, and among other passages, Matt. 11: 34.<sup>6</sup>

From this time he took up his residence in a district of the Arsinoitic name, in *Middle Egypt*, where in a short time he collected around him many pupils, on whom, having assembled them together, he inculcated the duties of their calling, in a long discourse in the Egyptian language, τῇ Αἰγυπτιακῇ γωνῇ. The many citations from the Old and New Testament, which occur in it, evince a more than ordinary acquaintance with the Bible.<sup>7</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Palladii Historia Lausiaca. c. XLIII. De Abbate Joanne urbis Lyco. p. 963. in Magna Biblioth. Vett. Patr. in XVII. Tomos distributa. T. XIII. Paris, 1654, fol.

<sup>3</sup> Vita Hilarionis, c. 30. "Repertis ibi duobus monachis Isaac et Pelusiano, quorum Isaac interpretes Antonii fuerat.

<sup>2</sup> Palladius c. 26. de Eulogio Alexandrino, p. 941. *Τούτων τῶν ὅλων λόγων ἑρμενεὺς αὐτὸς γέγονα, τοῦ μακαρίου Ἀντωνίου Ἑλληνιστὴ μὴ εἰδότος. Ἐγὼ γὰρ ἡπιστάμην ἀμφοτέρων τὰς γλώσσας, καὶ ἑρμένευσα αὐτοῖς.*

<sup>4</sup> Hieron. Catal. Script. Eccles. V. Antonius. "Misit Egyptiace ad diversa monasteria apostolici sensus sermonisque epistolas septem, quæ in Græcam linguam translatae sunt, quarum præcipua est ad Arsinoitas.

<sup>5</sup> Biblioth. Patr. per Margarin. De la Bigne, Paris 1576. fol. P. I. p. 91—110. Fragments of the Egyptian text, the end of the third, the fourth, and the beginning of the fifth letter, are in existence in the Borgian Museum. Zoega Catal., Codd. Sahid. n. CLXXI. p. 363. Fragments of others are found in Mingarelli, Codd. Nanian. Fasc. I. p. CXCVIII. seq.

<sup>6</sup> Athanas. Vit. S. Anton. c. 2. *Εἰσῆλθεν εἰς τὴν ἐκκλησίαν, καὶ συνέβη τότε τοῦ εὐαγγελίου ἀναγινώσκεσθαι, καὶ ἤκουσε τοῦ κυρίου λέγοντος τῷ πλουσίῳ κ. τ. λ. c. 3. Ὡς δὲ πάλιν εἰσελθὼν εἰς τὸ κυριακὸν ἤκουσε ἐν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ κ. τ. λ.*

<sup>7</sup> Athanas. Vit. S. Ant. c. 16—45.

Subsequently, to escape the intrusions of curiosity, he retired to remoter regions of the Thebaid, where he delivered discourses to the anchorites about him, which are full of biblical passages.<sup>1</sup>

Athanasius further states, that when Greek philosophers visited him he needed an interpreter in order to converse with them.<sup>2</sup>

When he spoke or wrote to his own countrymen, he spoke or wrote in Egyptian; when he was visited by Greeks, he spoke through an interpreter. He generally had an interpreter about him; and a writer, who had himself acted in this capacity, assures us that he had no knowledge of the Greek language. I do not see what more could be desired to substantiate the fact that Antonius did not understand Greek.

But, it is said, we are told in a biography of him that he learned Greek suddenly by a divine miracle. What biography? Were the ancients acquainted with any besides those of Athanasius and Evagrius, the latter of which was only a translation of the former? No person of respectability and talent ventured to attempt one after Athanasius. Jerome excuses himself on account of such a predecessor, and Rufinus represents it as superfluous and impracticable to execute such a work after him. What legend is there, then, to appeal to? The Bollandists found one which they esteemed worthy of regard; and it must possess very great antiquity and authority to contradict contemporary writers and even the very interpreter of Antonius. But, if he did not understand Greek, how happened it that he had, and how was it possible for him to have, so intimate an acquaintance with the Old and New Testament, except through a version? According to Augustine, he could even repeat the whole of the Sacred Scriptures from memory;<sup>3</sup> which is the less extraordinary, as there were many among the dwellers in the desert who could do the same.<sup>4</sup>

Thus, in the fourth century, Egyptian versions of the New Testament were current in Nitria, in the Arsinoitic Nome, in the Thebaid, in Upper, Lower, and Middle Egypt. This would certainly be a venerable age for these documents, even were none of them entitled to claim a higher antiquity.

There are, however, hints from which we may infer an earlier existence of the Egyptian versions. At the period of Dioclesian's persecution, just at the commencement of the fourth century, the Prætor visited Upper Egypt, in search of Christians; and one giving himself up of his own accord, he sat in judgment on him, tried him with the assistance of an interpreter, and then sentenced him to death.<sup>5</sup>

Hierakas of Leonto, about the close of the 3d century, composed books in the Egyptian language; particularly a treatise on the works

<sup>1</sup> Athanas. Vit. S. Anton. c. 55.

<sup>2</sup> Loc. cit. c. 72. *Πότε γοῦν φιλόσοφοι δύο ἦλθον πρὸς αὐτὸν Ἕλληνες.... ἐξελθὼν πρὸς αὐτοὺς ἔφη δι' ἑρμηνεύς.* c. 77. *Ἐφη πάλιν δι' ἑρμηνεύς.*

<sup>3</sup> Augustin. de Doctr. Christ. L. I. § 4.

<sup>4</sup> Palladius. c. XII. in Ammonio. *Παλαιὴν δὲ καὶ καινὴν γραφὴν ἀπεστήθισεν.* Vita Abb. Aphthonii c. XXXIX. *Ἀποστηθίζουσι πᾶσας τὰς γραφάς.* Comp. c. XXXII. de Erone. Epiphan. L. III. Hæres. LVIII. p. 1071, *Ἐν στόματι δε σχεδὸν πᾶσαν γραφὴν ἀπαγγέλλουσι.*

<sup>5</sup> Zoega. Catal. Codd. Memph. n. XIX. p. 20, 21.

of the six days. Such a production must certainly have been preceded by a version of the Mosaic writings.<sup>1</sup>

Extensive, however, as were the encroachments of the Greek language until the downfall of the Ptolemies, it was yet steadfastly excluded from the temples. Prayers and praises were offered to the gods in Egyptian only; and this was exclusively the language of religious worship. From this fact it may have become expedient, perhaps necessary, to introduce the Egyptian language into the Christian assemblies, in prayer, singing and exhortation; and hence in a short time there must have been occasion for a version of the sacred books.<sup>2</sup>

### § 92.

The Egyptian, or as some prefer to term it, the Coptic language, is divided into several dialects, the two principal of which are the Upper Egyptian or Thebaic, and the Lower Egyptian or Memphitic. The Arabians call the first likewise, *صعيدى*, *that of the Upper country*, *the Sahidic*; and the other *بسخري*, *the dialect of the Coast*, although its seat was always at a distance from the coast of the Mediterranean Sea, and it prevailed further in the interior of the country towards Memphis. Besides this, they reckon also a third, which is called *بشمورى*, the Bashmuri, or the Bschamyri, of the original seat of which we shall speak hereafter.<sup>3</sup>

### § 93.

Several beautiful MSS. of the version of the New Testament into the dialect of Lower Egypt are yet extant in the Libraries at Rome, Paris, and Oxford. Printed copies of it, also, are in the hands of the learned.<sup>4</sup>

Those who are qualified to judge are not, it is true, entirely satisfied as to the qualifications or mode of procedure of the editor. But it will ever be great merit to have broken the way, and to have been the first to bring to light so valuable a document.

The version was made from the revised text, and in the Gospels follows the MSS. BCL, in the Acts and Epistles ABC, and in general that class of MSS. which we have denominated Hesychian. We may hence infer its value, and how much it deserves to be examined with fresh industry. Its MSS. often vary from each other, and the critic might thus have excellent employment.

<sup>1</sup> Epiph. L. II. Hær. XLVII. § 3. p. 712. *Συνεγράφατο δε Ἑλληνικῶς τε καὶ Αἰγυπτιακῶς ἐξηρητοῦμένος καὶ συντάξας τῆς ἑξαμέρου.*

<sup>2</sup> Porphyry. De Abstin. L. IV. § 9. From Porphyry, Euseb. de Præp. Evang. L. III. c. 4. Steph. p. 57. Ed. Vigeri. p. 94. Clem. Alex. Pædagog. L. II. c. 2. Venet. 252, 253.

<sup>3</sup> See Quatremère, Recherches sur la langue et la littérature de l'Égypte. Paris, 1808. p. 21. for examples extracted from the Arabic-Coptic Grammar of Athanasius of Kus.

<sup>4</sup> Nov. Test. Ægyptium vulgo Copticum, ex MSS. Bodleianis descripsit, cum Vaticano et Parisiensibus contulit, et in Latinum sermonem convertit David Wilkins, Oxonii e Theatro Sheldoniano. 1716. 4to.



We may determine somewhat from this observation in regard to the age of this version; it cannot have been composed before the time of Hesychius, i. e. in the middle of the 3d century. Now, if it was current in Lower Egypt in the 4th century, the period at which it originated is determined with tolerable accuracy; as accurately as can be expected in a matter in which we are obliged to draw inferences from a comparison of facts, for want of express and definite information.

### § 94.

Woide first presented to the learned world specimens of the Upper Egyptian, Sahidic, version of the Gospels, in the readings of a few pages which he found in the British Museum.<sup>1</sup> After him, John Aloys Mingarelli published the text of some fragments of the Gospels which belonged to the Library of the Chevalier Nani, illustrating it with notes.<sup>2</sup> Similar fragments existed in the Library of Cardinal Borgia, which were examined and the various readings published by Münster, now Bishop of Seeland.<sup>3</sup> He also added Woide's readings and those furnished by the Nanian fragments. Meanwhile Anthony Georgi examined some very ancient fragments of the Thebaic version which were in Borgia's possession, and which contained by the side of the version the Greek text in uncial characters, from which however the former very frequently deviated. They contained John 6: 21—59 and 6: 68—8: 23.<sup>4</sup> Such were the fragments of the Gospels which were then known and published in Europe.

The Bodleian Library possesses the Acts according to this version, excepting the last four chapters, in a MS. (*Cod. Huntingt.* 394, 8vo.) from which Woide communicated to Michaelis some remarkable readings, which were published by him.<sup>5</sup>

This MS. contains also the Catholic Epistles of John and Jude, and a part of the 2d of Peter. The various readings of the first two, viz. the Epistles of John and Jude, have been published in the same way through Woide's means.<sup>6</sup>

Of the Pauline Epistles there were some fragments in the possession of Card. Borgia, which were collated by Münster; and three of them, from the two Epistles to Timothy, he published in full, in order to give those acquainted with this language an opportunity to judge respecting the character of this version.<sup>7</sup>

<sup>1</sup> John Andreas Cramer's "Beyträge zur Beförderung theologischer und anderer wichtigen Kenntnisse." III. Th. 1779.

<sup>2</sup> *Ægyptiorum codd. reliquæ Venetiis in bibliotheca Naniana asservatæ.* Fasc. I. Bononiæ. 1785.

<sup>3</sup> M. Friedr. Münster Comment. de indole vers. N. T. Sahidicæ Hafniæ 1789.

<sup>4</sup> Fragmentum Evangelii S. Johannis Græco-Copto-Thebaicum sæculi IV. Ad-ditamentum ex vetustissimis membranis lectionum evangelicarum . . . ex Veliterno Museo Borgiano . . . opera et studio F. Augustini Antonii Georgii eremitæ Augustiniani. Romæ apud. Ant. Fulgonium. 1789. 4to.

<sup>5</sup> J. D. Michaelis Oriental. exeget. Bibliothek III. Th. p. 199-208.

<sup>6</sup> Idem. X. Th. 1776. p. 198-214.

<sup>7</sup> M. Friedr. Münster Comm. de indole vers. N. T. Sahid.—accedunt fragmenta Epist. Pauli ad Timotheum. § 16. n. 65. seq.



About the same time, Adler transcribed some passages of Matthew and Luke out of the increasing treasures of the Cardinal, and subsequently communicated them to Woide, who continued to collect fragments with laudable assiduity. The latter gathered single chapters of the Gospels and Epistles, and even smaller quotations, from church MSS., and procured further fragments from Upper Egypt,<sup>1</sup> and with the aid of what had already been published through the press, gradually succeeded in compiling a Sahidic New Testament, which has indeed many chasms, but is of great consequence in criticism and philology. Woide died without having completed his undertaking, but it was ably finished by Henry Ford, who corrected some mistakes of Woide's, and published the whole in a splendid form with several additions, as an appendix to *Codex Alexandrinus*.<sup>2</sup>

Unfortunately neither of the two English scholars had access to the Borgian collection, which contained many additional fragments of the Gospels and Pauline Epistles; among others the Epistles to the Philippians entire, excepting a few verses, and some chapters of the Apocalypse. Zoega has given a valuable catalogue of the passages supplied by these fragments, which must be sought in the Museum at Velletri by some future editor of the Sahidic New Testament.<sup>3</sup> Had he, instead, incorporated these supplements into his excellent work on the Borgiano-Egyptian MSS., we should have possessed what must now be sought anew. In place of this he contented himself with presenting but three fragments, Ephes. 5: 21-23. Rev. 19: 7-18. Rev. 20: 7-21: 3.<sup>4</sup>

### § 95.

Its text closely resembles that of the Hesychian MSS. It is not, however a revised text, but that of the *κοινή* *ἐκδοσις*, which is indeed very similar to the Hesychian, having proceeded from it. But in general it has no precise character, frequently agreeing with the Cambridge MS. D in peculiar readings, and frequently likewise containing peculiar variations of its own of considerable importance.

We will extract some readings, at present found only in D. In Luke 8: 41, the Sahidic version omits the words, *ὕπῃ ῥχε καί*; Luke 8: 42, it reads *ἀποθνήσκουσα*, instead of the clause *καὶ αὐτὴ ἀπέθνησκειν*; Luke 8: 43, *οὐκ ἴσχυσεν ὑπ' οὐδενὸς θεραπευθῆναι* is thus given, *ἣν οὐδὲ εἰς ἴσχυεν θεραπεύσαι*. 9: 10, for *εἰς τόπον ἔρεμον πόλ . . . καλ. Βηθσ.* it reads *εἰς κώμην λεγομένην Βηθσαϊδὰ*. 9: 37, *ἐν τῇ ἑξῆς ἡμέρᾳ—διὰ τῆς ἡμέρας*. 13: 25, *καὶ κρούειν τὴν θύραν*, it omits *τὴν θύραν*, and in 13: 27, the words *πόθεν ἐστὶ*. 22: 24, *αὐτῶν δοκεῖ εἶναι—ἂν εἴη*. 32: 26, *νεώτερος—μικρότερος*. 23: 14, *εὐρον ἐν τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ τούτῳ αἴτιον—εὐρον αἴτιον*; John 6: 23, the words *εὐχαριστήσαντος τοῦ κυρίου* are excluded; 6: 25, *ὥδε γέγονας—ὥδε ἐλήλυθας*. 7: 10, *ὥς* is wanting before *ἐν κρυπτῷ*. 7: 23, *ἐμοὶ χολᾶτε—πῶς ἐμοὶ χολᾶτε*. 7: 52, *καὶ*

<sup>1</sup> Woidii De vers. bibliorum Ægypt. dissert. c. 2. De vers. N. T. Sahid.

<sup>2</sup> Appendix ad editionem N. T. e cod. MS. Alexandrino a C. G. Woide descripti, in qua continentur fragm. N. T.—dialecti superioris Ægypti etc. Oxon e Typograph. Clarendon. 1799. fol.

<sup>3</sup> Zoega, Cat. Codd. Copt. MSS. Musei Borgian. p. 103-106.

<sup>4</sup> Zoega, loc. cit. p. 218-20.

ἴδε ὅτι—καὶ ἴδε τὰς γραφάς, ὅτι· 10: 2, ποιμὴν ἐστὶ—αὐτὸς ἐστὶν ὁ ποιμὴν· 10: 12, ἀρπάξει αὐτὰ καὶ—ἀρπάξει καὶ· 11: 33, ἐνεβριμῆσατο τῷ πνεύματι, καὶ ἐτάραξεν ἑαυτὸν—ἐταράχθη τῷ πνεύματι, ὡς ἐμβριμώμενος· 11: 39, ἡ ἀδελφὴ—Μάρθα ἡ ἀδελφὴ· 12: 29, βροντὴν γεγονέναι—ὅτι βροντὴ γέγονεν· 12: 30, ἡ φωνὴ γέγονεν—ἡ φωνὴ ἦλθεν· 13: 36, ὑπάγω ἐγὼ· 17: 5, πρὸ τοῦ τὸν κόσμον εἶναι, παρὰ σοὶ—παρὰ σοὶ πρὸ τοῦ γενέσθαι τὸν κόσμον· 18: 1, χειμάρρου, τοῦ Κεδροῦ· 20: 22, ἐνεφύσησε αὐτοῖς καί· . . .

We will give a few examples of such readings as are peculiar to it alone. John 6: 33, ὁ γὰρ ἄριστος οὗτος υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ ἐστί· 6: 39, ἵνα οἷς δέδωκέ μοι, μὴ ἀπολέσω ἐξ αὐτῶν, ἀλλὰ ἀναστήσω αὐτοὺς· 7: 11, ἐξήτουν αὐτὸν ἐν τῷ ναῷ, καὶ ἔλεγον· 7: 26, οἱ ἄρχοντες καὶ οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς, ὅτι· 10: 7, εἰμὶ ὁ ποιμὴν τῶν προβάτων· 10: 31, οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι, ἵνα ἐκβολῶσιν αὐτόν· 10: 33, οὐ λιθάζομέν σε, ἀλλ' ὅτι βλασφημεῖς· 14: 22, Ἰούδας ὁ Κανανίτης, κύριε, τί γέγονεν, ὅτι ἡμῖν μέλλεις ἐμφανίζειν σεαυτὸν, καὶ οὐχὶ μέλλεις ἐμφανίζειν σεαυτὸν τῷ κόσμῳ κ. τ. λ.

The extracts from the Huntington MS. of the Sahidic Acts of the Apostles, which Woide has presented, all tend to show that there is a remarkable similarity between the text of Codex D and that of the Sahidic version. From the specimens which he has given it is indeed very great.

There is no Greek MS. now extant which exhibits the κοινὴ ἔκδοσις of the text of the Catholic Epistles. Their appearance in this version, it is true, resembles very much that of the MSS. of the Hesychian edition; they are not, however, perfectly like them, but exhibit variations which confirm what we have before said concerning the text which is the basis of this version. We will cite some examples which will convince us of the unregulated condition of the text. 1 Epistle of John 1: 2, καὶ ἐφανερώθη ἡμῖν, ἐώρακαμεν αὐτήν· ὁ ἐώρακαμεν κ. τ. λ. 2: 17, ὁ δὲ ποιῶν τὸ θέλημα τοῦ θεοῦ, μένει εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα, ὡς αὐτὸς μένει εἰς αἰῶνα. Thus Cyprian also read the passage: "*Qui autem fecerit voluntatem Dei, manet in æternum, quomodo Deus manet in æternum.*" (*Tract. II. De Hab. virg. and De lapsis. Serm. 5tus.*) In 1 John 3: 10, this version reads instead of πᾶς ὁ μὴ ποιῶν δικαιοσύνην, as likewise Origen (*Comment. in Joh. T. IV. Opp. p. 323,*) and Tertullian (*De pudicit. C. 19*): πᾶς ὁ μὴ ὢν δίκαιος . . . 1 John 4: 2, γινώσκειται τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ θεοῦ, καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα τῆς πλάνης. 3d Epistle of John 3, μαρτυροῦντων περὶ σοῦ ἐν ἀληθείᾳ, and verse 10, καὶ μὴ ἁρκοῦμ. ἐπὶ τούτ. οὐδὲ ἐπιδέχεται ὑμᾶς, οὐδὲ ἐπιδέχεται ἀδελφοὺς.

It is nearly so with Paul's Epistles. They ordinarily adhere to the MSS. ABC, or to ABCDEFG; sometimes also to DEFG, or some of these MSS., when they stand alone, unsupported by the rest. The last case occurs, e. g. in 1 Cor. 2: 4, πειθοῖς σοφίας; 3: 13, ἀποκαλυφθήσεται DE; 10: 27, where after ἀπίστων, the MSS. DEFG subjoin εἰς δαίμονον; 12: 10, where the version reads διάκρισις, like G.; 14: 14, εἰὰν προσεύχωμαι FG; Galat. 4: 21, τὸν νόμον οὐκ ἀναγιγνώσκετε; 28, ὑμεῖς—τέκνα ἐστέ DFG; 6: 2, ἀναπληρώσετε G; Col. 2: 8, ἐκ τοῦ στόματος ὑμῶν μὴ ἐκπορευέσθω G; 3: 13, οὕτω καὶ ὑμεῖς ποιεῖτε DEFG; 2d Thess. 1: 12, it omits the word Χριστοῦ after τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ, like DE; 2: 2, it has ἀπὸ τοῦ νοῦς ὑμῶν, like DE; 1 Tim. 2: 1, παρακαλεῖ οὖν πρῶτον, like DE; 2: 5, διαλογισμοῦ, like FG;

6: 17, τοῖς πλουσίοις τοῦ νῦν αἰῶνος, DE; and πάντα πλουσίως εἰς ἀπόλαυσιν, likewise like DE.

It contains, however, variations not found in any other MSS.; as, 1 Tim. 2: 7, ἀλήθ. λέγ. οὐ ψεύδομαι, ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσι ἐν πίστει καὶ ἀληθείᾳ; 3: 2, ἀνδρα νηφαλίου ἐν σωφροσύνῃ, κόσμιον; 3: 15, πῶς δεῖ ἐν οἴκῳ θεοῦ ζώντος ἀναστρέφεσθαι, ἥτις ἐστὶ στυλος; 6: 10, φιλαργυρία, ἢ τινὰς ἐξ αὐτῶν ἀπεπλάνησεν; 6: 20, τὴν παραθήκην φύλαξον, ἣν παρέ-  
θηκά σοι, ἐντροπ. . . .

Considering the city through which the Greek language was introduced into Egypt, and its situation in respect to different parts of the country, and estimating accordingly the progress of Hellenism by a gradual communication to remote districts, it cannot be denied that the Greek must have reached the Thebaid late, gained a comparatively feeble footing, and there first fell into decay and disuse at the extinction of the power of the Ptolemies. Alexandria, situated on the borders of the country, or rather itself the entrance to Egypt from the sea, was the place whence Hellenism diffused itself first in the vicinity, then gradually, step by step, into the remotest districts. In the vicinity of Alexandria, Hellenism constantly received fresh sustenance, while the parts of the country more remote from court, the special rendezvous of the Greeks, were less subject to the intrusions of them and their language. Hence, when the ancient language again reared its head, after the extinction of the Greek supremacy, it first asserted its prerogative where its strength was greatest, viz. in Upper Egypt. Consequently, it was in this part of the country that a version of the Bible in the national language was first needed and desired.

I derive a further argument for the very high antiquity of the Thebaic version from the character of its language. It is surprising to find in the language of the Upper Egyptian version a much greater number of Greek words, than are contained in the language of the Memphitic or Lower Egyptian version; as exactly the reverse would be expected, viz. that the latter should be most disfigured and corrupted by the Greek. The solution of this thing lies in the difference between the versions in point of antiquity. When the Memphitic version was composed, the Egyptian was already to a considerable degree purified from foreign innovations; while, on the contrary, when the Sahidic version was executed, the language still contained the old foreign materials which had been forced into it by the supremacy of the Greeks.

### § 96.

In the Borgian Museum there were found small fragments of a third Egyptian version, the language of which differs from both of those which we have just been considering. These contained the passages 1 Cor. 7: 36—9: 16, and 14: 33—15: 35, which were published by two scholars nearly at the same time, although, to say the least, independently of each other; viz. by Georgi at Rome, and by Münter at Copenhagen.<sup>1</sup> The Cardinal subsequently obtained further fragments of this version, viz. two passages of Isaiah, and the following of the New

<sup>1</sup> Georgi in Præf. ad Fragm. Joann. Græco-Copto-Thebaicum, §. 12. p. LV. seq. Münter in Commentat. de vers. N. T. Sahid. §. 12. 13. p. 75. seq.



Testament: John 4: 28—34. 4: 36—40. 4: 43—47. 4: 48—53. 1 Cor. 6: 9—9: 16. 14: 3—15: 35. Ephes. 6: 18 to the end. Philipp. 1: 1—2: 2. 1 Thess. 1: 1—3: 5. Heb. 5: 10—10: 22. These, like the former, were published by two competitors, equally independent of each other, in the same cities, Rome and Copenhagen. Zoega adorned his catalogue of the Borgiano-Coptic MSS. with them,<sup>1</sup> and Engelbreth published them separately.<sup>2</sup> The former gave only the bare text, without any addition, and even without any division of the words. Engelbreth bestowed more pains upon it, accompanied it with a version, with an introduction and critical notes at the end, and gained himself the credit of accomplishing with industry and ability what must at any rate have been done. On the other hand, there are some discrepancies between them in regard to the text, the true reading of which frequently appears to be on the side of Zoega, by whom the original could be consulted repeatedly and at pleasure, and accurately investigated.<sup>3</sup>

These fragments, the language of which is neither Thebaic nor Memphitic, led father Georgi to the opinion that a third dialect was now discovered, viz. the Bashmuric. In looking around for the district in which this dialect was prevalent, several reasons led him to fix upon the Oases, and particularly the Ammonian Oasis; and he even termed it the Ammonian dialect.<sup>4</sup>

His mistake as to Bashmur, or the country of the Bashmurites, was corrected by Zoega, who proved that Bashmur was a country to the eastward of the Delta, which was consequently the seat of the Bashmurian dialect and version.<sup>5</sup> A French scholar has shown more at length and from a citation of numerous passages, that Bashmur was situated in the Delta to the East, between the Damietta and Ashmunerroman arms of the Nile. Yet, from the striking analogy of these fragments with the dialect of Upper Egypt, he was induced to transfer the seat of the dialect which they present towards Upper Egypt; and in order to avoid the force of the passage in Athanasius of Kus, who enumerates but three dialects in Egypt, he makes the two Upper Oases, the smaller and greater, to be situated not in Egypt, but by its side, without it.<sup>6</sup>

The Danish scholar, who investigated and published the first fragments nearly at the same time with Georgi, came to a different conclusion from this. He flatly denied that their peculiarity of language was sufficient to require the admission of a separate dialect, and maintained that it was only a variety of the Upper Egyptian.<sup>7</sup> Engelbreth, on the other hand, endeavored to sustain the title of this version to be considered

<sup>1</sup> Zoega, Catal. p. 145—169.

<sup>2</sup> W. F. Engelbreth *Fragm. Basmurico-Copt. Vet. et Nov. Test. quæ in Museo Borgiano Velitris adservantur, etc.* Hauniae, 1811. 4to.

<sup>3</sup> *Observat. sur les fragm. Coptes-Bashmouriques publiés par M. Engelbreth.* Article de M. Champollion le jeune. p. 350—361, dans les *Annales Encyclopédiques*. Février, 1818.

<sup>4</sup> Georgi lib. cit. Præf. § 14—17.

<sup>5</sup> Zoega. Cat. p. 140—144. Quatremère, *Recherches sur la langue et la littérature de l'Egypte*. Sect. V. p. 147. seq.

<sup>6</sup> Quatremère, *Recherches*. p. 216, 217.

<sup>7</sup> Münter *Comment. de vers. N. T. Sahid.* § 12. p. 77.



as a distinct dialect, which he asserts to be the Bashmuri, the seat of which was in the Delta.<sup>1</sup> Champollion the younger, however, who reviews his position, perceives no necessity of supposing it a peculiar dialect. The language of the third version, he thinks, was intermediate between the Upper and Lower Egyptian, the seat of which was probably Faiom.<sup>2</sup>

It would seem that in the investigation of this question, which we cannot here discuss, sufficient distinction has not been made between dialect and idiom. The softness of pronunciation which is one peculiarity of this version, (inasmuch as it almost always avoided the aspirates, Θ, Φ, Χ, as also *Phai* and *Chei*, and instead of *P*, the enunciation of which seems to have been impossible, uses, like Alcibiades, the letter Α,) as likewise the permutation of Α for Ο, and Ε for Α, are perfectly within the limits of an idiom. The case is the same in respect to particular words which are current only in certain districts.<sup>3</sup> If there be no peculiar form added in the variation of verbs and nouns, so that a difference is not only manifest in the pronunciation or in particular expressions, but is inherent in the structure of the language, it cannot be regarded as a dialect.

But this is not the case with the (so called) Bashmuri fragments. In the forms which they exhibit they adhere to the Thebaic dialect, yet not so exclusively as not to adopt some from the Memphitic; being a kind of combination of the two. On this account, I have long indulged the conjecture that they represented the idiom of Middle Egypt. If Champollion restricts this supposition to the province of Faiom, I cannot see what absolute objection there can be against him, but I am desirous of seeing the promised arguments in favor of that district.

This is not, however, the only Egyptian idiom of which remains are extant. Zoega tells us of a monastic legend which vibrates between the Thebaic, Memphitic, and Bashmuri dialects, and of which he is inclined to make a fourth.<sup>4</sup>

A more important question to us is, what text the third version follows? Engelbreth presents us with the collation of it, the result of which is as follows. The fragment John 6: 28—53, usually adheres to the MSS. BCL. The Pauline Epistles follow the MSS. ABC; but they are not confined to this regulated text, and frequently make a digression to DEFG, or some one of these MSS. Hence they exhibit the ancient text of the unrevised or common edition. This state of the text terminated in the last half of the 3d century in Egypt and Asia; so that we see the antiquity to which this version lays claim. The char-

<sup>1</sup> Engelbreth *Fragmenta Basmur. Copt.* § 2. p. VII. seq.

<sup>2</sup> Observations dans les *Annales Encyclopédiques*. Fevrier, 1818.

<sup>3</sup> Among the words enumerated as peculiar to the Bashmuri dialect, (Engelbreth *Fragm. Basmur. Copt.* p. IX.) are, in Isai. V. 20. *KEMETC*, and in Isai. V. 25, *ΣNET*; yet both occur in the Memphitic version under the forms *XEMC* and *ΣONT*. The word *ovata* is the same as *ovot*; and *τοπ* is used in the Thebaic dialect for *συνήθεια*. (Münter, *Commentatio de indole version. N. T. Sahidicæ*, p. 81.) For *ῥίχα*, i. e. *ἀνθρώπων*, in Isai. V. 24, the expression *ΘEMIO*, in the Memphitic *ΘAMIO*, is used, meaning *πλάσμα*; i. e. simply the literal term instead of one highly figurative which cannot be made use of with propriety in every language.

<sup>4</sup> Zoega, *Catalog. Codd. Sahid. n.* CLXXII.

acter of the language supports this claim. It is as corrupt and as much mixed with Greek words, as we have seen the Thebaic version to be ; and in the case of the latter we regarded this characteristic as evidence of its antiquity.

But here I cannot help doubting whether the third be really a distinct version made from the original text. It follows the Thebaic version step by step and word for word, in such a manner that it would seem as if the latter was thankfully adopted as it was, and only transcribed into the third idiom. Whenever the Thebaic retains the Greek expression, this does so too ; where the Thebaic adopts a peculiar phraseology, so does this : e. g. 1 Cor. 9: 15, *κενώσῃ, ΝΑΨΤΡΕΨΑΝΤΙ* *ΕΨΙΘΥΕΙΤ*, Phil. 1: 10, *ἀπρόσκοποι, ΕΛΛΕΝ ΝΟΒΙ ΔΨΙ* *ΕΣΟΝ ΕΡΑΤΕΝ*. Where it deviates for a moment from the Thebaic reading, it is either from an error of the copyist (e. g. 1 Cor. 9: 14,) or a gloss. (Heb. 7: 20. *ΝΑΨΑΕΝΕΣ*.)

It would be almost wholly impracticable to compare these fragments with the Thebaic text, were it not for the facilities for the purpose furnished us by Engelbreth. He collected as many of the corresponding Thebaic passages as he could find in the Borgian Museum, and placed the third version by their side. We thus obtain the following passages, which are wanting in Woide: 1 Cor. 15: 5—53. Philipp. 1: 7—23. 1 Thessal. 1: 4—3: 6. Heb. 9: 2—11. 9: 24—30. 10: 5—10.

#### ETHIOPIC VERSION.

#### § 97.

In the time of Constantine the Great, a merchant, or some inquisitive person belonging to Tyre, made a voyage to Ethiopia through the Red Sea. He and the whole ship's company were murdered by the negroes, with the exception of two youths, Frumentius and Aedesius, who were carried to the king as slaves, and on account of their talents met with an agreeable lot at court. After the king's death, during the minority of his son and the regency of his mother, Frumentius endeavored to establish in these regions the Christian religion, to which he adhered ; and when sure of success, took a journey to Alexandria to Athanasius, by whom he was consecrated bishop, invested with plenary authority and provided with assistants.<sup>1</sup>

This Frumentius is mentioned by Athanasius in his apology to the Emperor Constantius in which he complains that he had been persecuted even by letters to the government of Ethiopia, and that Frumentius, bishop of Axum, had been summoned to be indoctrinated in Arianism.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Rufinus in the first book of his continuation of Eusebius' Church history (which is called in some editions Eusebius' 10th book,) 9th chap. Socrat. Hist. Eccl. L. I. c. 19. Theodoret. Hist. Eccl. L. I. c. 23. Sozomen. L. II. c. 24. Abulpharag. Hist. Dyn. p. 135. text. Arab.

<sup>2</sup> Athanas. Apol. ad Constant. c. 29.

He quotes a summons of this kind, in which Frumentius is suspected of being an adherent to Athanasius, and is called upon to appear before George, patriarch of Egypt, and have his creed examined.<sup>1</sup>

Cedrenus and Nicephorus Callistus, therefore, clearly erred in assigning the foundation of Christianity in Ethiopia to the times of Justinian,<sup>2</sup> and appear to have taken the mission of Nonnosus to Axum, which occurred under this emperor, for an attempt at conversion, although nothing is said of religious objects.<sup>3</sup>

Now while Frumentius was prosecuting with so much vigor his project of converting the Abyssinians, he must have conceived the idea of a version of the sacred books in the language of the country, if not for the benefit of the people, at least for the use of those who were preparing for the ministry. One alone could not have seemed sufficient for such an extensive territory, in which there was so great a variety of dialects. An Arabic writer, who saw a part of Abyssinia, reckons more than fifty varieties of language in the district of Zaila alone.<sup>4</sup>

The Abyssinians mention with especial honor among their first preachers of Christianity, one Aba Salama;<sup>5</sup> and it is to him that a native poet and an Ethiopic martyrology ascribe the translation of the books of the Law and Gospel from the Arabic into the native language.<sup>6</sup> Yet we must have great doubts as to the character of the original Arabic text, from which this version was made; or else the version we have cannot have been the work of a man so highly venerated among his countrymen.

It is composed in the ancient dialect of Axum, which, when another dynasty from Sewa mounted the throne, was compelled to yield the palm to the Amharic dialect, the latter becoming the court language.<sup>7</sup> It was first published through the press at Rome, and afterwards reprinted in the English Polyglot.<sup>8</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Ibid. c. 31.

<sup>2</sup> Cedren. Annal. L. XVII. c. 32. Niceph. Hist. Eccles. L. VIII. c. 35.

<sup>3</sup> Photii Biblioth. Cod. 3.

<sup>4</sup> Macrizi Hist. regum Islamit. in Abyssinia, edit. Theodor. Rinck. Lugdun. Bat. p. 14. text. Arab.

<sup>5</sup> Jobi Ludolphi Hist. Æthiop. L. III. c. 2. edit. Orig.

<sup>6</sup> Idem. Comment. in Hist. Æth. L. III. c. 4. p. 295.

<sup>7</sup> Idem. Hist. Æthiop. L. I. c. 15.

<sup>8</sup> In the year 1584 the first vol. appeared at Rome in 4to. containing the four Gospels, the Apocalypse, the Catholic Epistles, the Epistle of Paul to the Hebrews, and lastly the Acts. In the following year, the remaining thirteen Pauline Epistles appeared in a second volume. It is objected to this edition that it is anything but correct. Afterwards appeared separately: "*S. Johannis Apostoli et Evangelistæ Epistolæ Catholicæ tres, Arabice et Æthiopice, curâ ac industriâ Jo. Georg. Nisselii et Theodori Petræi. Lugd. Bat. 1654.*" 4to. and "*S. Judæ Apostoli Epistolæ Cathol. versio Arab. et Æthiop. a Jo. Georg. Nisselio et Theod. Petræo. Lugd. Bat. 1654.*" 4to., in which there is said to be some amendment of the Ethiopic text. The whole N. T. appeared in 1657 in the London Polyglot, (for which a faulty and frequently illegible MS. was used,) on the whole no better than before, or, as Ludolf says: "*retentis mendis veteribus et novis superadditis.*" The fidelity of the subjoined Latin version, likewise, is not much commended.

## § 98.

The text of the four Gospels does not adhere constantly to any class of MSS. Sometimes it appears to agree with the Egyptian emendation; then again with the Constantinopolitan; frequently likewise with the third, which we have termed Origen's edition. We find in it, however, readings of ancient date, which occur in Codex D, on the margin of the Philoxenian version, or in the Latin versions antecedent to Jerome. It would seem, therefore, either that several versions are combined in this one copy (which is very possible, as the Abyssinian with whom Job Ludolf was acquainted remarked a great difference between our printed copies and the MS. ones of his own country); or else several MSS. of different Recensions were used in the composition of this version.

It cannot be denied that two readings have frequently been united into one; as in Luke 6: 48, where some MSS. after *σαλευσαι αὐτήν* read *διὰ τὸ καλῶς οἰκοδομεῖσθαι αὐτήν*, instead of *τεθεμελίωτο γὰρ ἐπὶ πέτρᾳ*, and others *τεθεμελίωτο γὰρ καλῶς*, and this version unites the two thus, *τεθεμελίωτο γὰρ καλῶς, διὰ τὸ καλῶς οἰκοδομεῖσθαι αὐτήν*. In Luke 9: 4, some MSS. read instead of *καὶ ἐκεῖθεν ἐξέρχεσθε* the opposite *καὶ ἐκεῖθεν μὴ ἐξέρχεσθε*, others *ἕως ἐξέρχεσθε*; and the Ethiopic, *καὶ ἐκεῖθεν μὴ ἐξέρχεσθε, ἕως ἐξέρχεσθε*. In Luke 9: 35, the Constantinopolitan MSS. have *ὁ υἱὸς μου ὁ ἀγαπητός* and the Egyptian *ὁ υἱὸς μου ὁ ἐκλελεγμένος*; the version has both. In Luke 11: 13, some MSS. have the reading *ἀγαθὸν δόμα* for *πνεῦμα ἅγιον*, and the Ethiopic version has *ἀγαθὸν δόμα πνεύματος ἁγίου*. In John 6: 69, the Egyptian Recension has *σὺ εἶ ὁ ἅγιος τοῦ θεοῦ*; the Constantinopolitan, *σὺ εἶ ὁ Χριστὸς ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ ζῶντος*; the Ethiopic, *σὺ εἶ ὁ Χριστὸς, ὁ ἅγιος υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ ζῶντος*. In John 12: 28, *δόξασόν σου τὸ ὄνομα*, some MSS. read *δόξασόν σου τὸν υἱόν*; this version, *δόξασόν σου τὸ ὄνομα καὶ τὸν υἱόν*, etc. I trust there is no need of accumulating further proofs, to convince us that the text of the Gospels is derived from various constituent sources.

The editors were least successful in respect to the book of Acts. They possessed only a very imperfect copy of it, and were frequently obliged to translate into Ethiopic themselves in order to supply deficiencies. This they generally did from the Vulgate; and of this fact they make no secret. In the preface to the Acts they say: "*Ista acta apostolorum maximam partem Romæ translata sunt e linguâ Latinâ et Græcâ in Æthiopicam propter defectum protographi.*"<sup>1</sup>

That the translator of the Gospels had a Greek MS. before him is clear from the mistakes and misapprehensions which we find. In Matt. 4: 13, he took *ἐν ὄρεσις* for *ὄρεσι* or *ἐν ὄρει*, *on mount Zebulon*; in Mark 2: 23, he interprets the phrase *ὁδὸν ποιεῖν*, *to ride*, instead of *to go on foot*; *ἀποδοκιμάζειν*, in Mark 8: 31, he regards as synonymous with *δοκιμάζειν*; the word *ἐφημερία* he could not comprehend, but translates *ἐξ ἐφημερίας Ἀβιά*, in Mark 1: 5, as though it meant *ἐν ἡμέραις Ἀβιά*, and in the 8th verse has entirely omitted it.

The Epistles of Paul were translated from a Greek original, as I in-

<sup>1</sup> Walton, Proleg. XV. Ludolph. Comm. in Hist. Æth. L. III. c. 4. p. 297.



fer from a very ludicrous mistake in the version. In 1 Cor. 12: 28, the words καὶ οὗς μὲν ἔθετο are rendered thus: "*God set an ear in the church* etc., which rendering originated in a misconception of the little word οὗς.

The text of these, however, as well as of the Catholic Epistles, adheres with tolerable exactness to the Egyptian Recension, as might be expected from the situation of the country and its ecclesiastical relations.

The Apocalypse, likewise, adheres to the same Recension. This version, venerable for its antiquity, and valuable on account of the text which it follows, certainly merits greater attention than has been devoted to it, and ought to be published anew in an edition founded on good MSS. Such a work might with peculiar propriety occupy the attention of the British Bible Society.

## ARABIC VERSIONS.

## § 99.

In the 96th year of the Hegira, the 718th of the Christian era, at the death of Alwalid the son of Abdolmelek, the Arabs had already conquered the East, subjected Egypt and the whole northern coast of Africa to their sway, and founded a kingdom in Spain. Their language extended itself with their victories into all the three quarters of the globe.

The Christians in Asia and Africa who held the creed of the Nestorians and Monophysites, were treated under the dominion of the Caliphs with less severity than their brethren. Both these sects retained their patriarchs, one of whom had his seat at Antioch, and the other, as head of the churches of Egypt and Africa, at Alexandria. In Spain the Arabic supremacy did indeed cause some changes, but without on the whole doing much injury to Christianity.

In proportion as the language of the conquerors gained universal currency, the necessity among Christians of Arabic versions of the Sacred Scriptures became more urgent. In particular Alwalid Ben Abdolmelek added to this necessity, by prohibiting Christians from using any other tongue but the Arabic in all public transactions of business.<sup>1</sup>

*Latino-Arabic Version.*

## § 100.

The natural consequence was soon seen. Alwalid had not been long dead, when, about the middle of the 8th century, in Spain, the sacred Scriptures of the Old and New Testament were translated into Arabic. Of this version only, among all the Arabic versions, do we know the

<sup>1</sup> Gregor. Abulpharag. Hist. Dynast. Dyn. VII. p. 201. Arabic text.

age and the author. It was John, Bishop of Seville, who, when the Latin language was constantly falling more and more into disuse, executed this version for the benefit of Christians, and also, as he trusted, of the Moors.<sup>1</sup> It was made, as we should expect, from the Latin, and from the text of Jerome, which, in the 7th century, had become generally current in Spain. The use, therefore, which could have been made of it in criticism, must have consisted chiefly in consulting it for the purpose of restoring the text of Jerome's edition. The Jesuit Mariana saw many MS. copies of it in his time.

*Arabic Version from the Syriac.*

§ 101.

The Syrians under the patriarchate of Antioch felt equal need of an Arabic version. One was executed from the Peschito. Thomas Von Erpe has published the Acts of the Apostles, the Pauline and Catholic Epistles, according to this version, in his Arabic edition of the New Testament.<sup>2</sup> His MS. contained a different text of the Gospels.


The text of the Acts bears the most manifest marks of its origin. In Acts 1: 1, τὸν μὲν πρῶτον λόγον ἐποιήσαμεν is translated by the Peschito—**ܕܕܠܐ ܕܡܪܝܢ ܕܡܪܝܢܐ ܕܡܪܝܢܐ**, and by Arab. Erp. **قد كتبت** **اولا**;—**καὶ νεφέλη ὑπέλαβεν αὐτὸν ἀπὸ τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν αὐτῶν**, (Acts 1: 9,) **ܕܡܪܝܢܐ ܕܡܪܝܢܐ ܕܡܪܝܢܐ ܕܡܪܝܢܐ**,—**وقبلته سبحانه ثم تواري عن عيونهم** **وجد**;—**ܕܡܪܝܢܐ ܕܡܪܝܢܐ ܕܡܪܝܢܐ ܕܡܪܝܢܐ**, (Acts 1: 10,) **وجد**;—**ܕܡܪܝܢܐ ܕܡܪܝܢܐ ܕܡܪܝܢܐ ܕܡܪܝܢܐ**

<sup>1</sup> Mariana de Reb. Hispan. L. VII. c. 3. "Joannes Hispalensis præsul divinos libros linguâ Arabicâ donabat utriusque nationis salutî consulens: quoniam Arabicâ linguâ multus usus erat Christianis æque atque Mauris; Latina passim ignorabatur. Ejus interpretationis exempla ad nostram ætatem conservata sunt; extantque non uno in loco in Hispanis."

<sup>2</sup> He published it from a MS. in the Library at Leyden, "ex elegantissimo bibliothecæ nostræ codice, manu exarato in monasterio S. Joannis, in Thebaidos deserto, anno æræ Diocletiani . . . 1059 id est Christi 1342." He obtained, moreover, from Francis Raphelung a collation of the Acts and Epistles in another MS. The following work first appeared as a kind of experiment: "Pauli Apostoli ad Romanos Epistola Arabice. Ex Bibliotheca Leidensi. Leidæ in Typographiâ Erpenianâ ling. Orient. 1615." 4to. Though not mentioned on the title-page, the Epistle to the Galatians was published with it. In the following year the whole New Testament appeared: "Novum D. N. J. Christi Testam. Arabice ex bibliothecâ Leidensi, edente Thoma Erpenio. Leidæ in Typogr. ling. Orient." A. 1616. 4to. The MS. of which Raphelung communicated a collation was probably the same as that from which the Epistle to Titus was printed at the Raphelengian press. "D. Pauli Apost. Epist. ad Titum Arabice: cum Joann. Antonidæ Alcmariani interlineari versione Lat. ad verbum ex officinâ Plantiniana Raphelengii. 1612." 4. This text is, like the Erpenian, from the Syriac. The editor derived it from a transcript of an Oxford Codex, made, as he states in the preface, by Joseph Abudacni.

— ἡ δὲ πόλις ὅλη (1: 12), ἔστιν ἐγγύς; — رجلان  
 — جمعاً؟ إني (1: 15), ὄχλος ὀνομάτων; — وهو الي جانب  
 ὁ δὲ ἄνθρωπος (1: 18), καὶ προηνής γεγόμενος; — متحفل أداس  
 τῇ ἰδίᾳ; — وسقط علي وجهه علي الأرض; — لا أزيد  
 بلغة أهل — جمعاً؟ إني (1: 19), διαλέκτω αὐτῶν;  
 الذي ترميته — ἡ δὲ πόλις — ἡ δὲ πόλις; — τοῦτ' ἔστι; — البلد

These examples taken from the first chapter will suffice; for it is not necessary to read and collect with care passages thinly scattered about, to prove how precisely every minute turn of expression in the Peschito is rendered in the Arabic text.

The case is the same, too, with the Epistles of Paul. We will quote merely a few expressions from the commencement of the Epistle to the Hebrews, in proof of this: τῷ ῥήματι τῆς δυνάμεως αὐτοῦ, (1: 3,) ;—δι' αὐτοῦ καθαροῦ.

[illegible]

There are also, as we might expect, evidences that the translator used Nestorian manuscripts.<sup>1</sup>

The Epistle of James, the 1st of Peter and John, likewise conform to the Peschito. But the text of the other Catholic Epistles in the Peschito, the 2d of Peter, the 2d and 3d of John, and that of Jude, which were derived from another source, bears little or no resemblance to the Arabic of Erpenius. E. g., it is a peculiarity of the Syriac that in the Epistle of Jude, v. 6, it renders *δεσμοῖς ἀδίοις* by *unknown chains*; that in v. 12, it reads *ἀργαίαις* instead of *ἀγάπαις* (*ΑΡΓΙΑΙΣ-ΑΓΑΠΑΙΣ*), and takes *ἐκχιζωθέντα* to signify *trees sprouting from the roots*. Now of these and other peculiarities there is no trace in the Arabic version.

\* Adler, N. T. vers. Syriacæ, Simplex, etc. denuo examinatæ, L. I. p. 36, 37.

I find in this Epistle but one instance in which they agree in an unusual reading. Both change ἐξεχύθησαν (v. 11) into ἐξενάυθησαν. I have also observed in these versions, throughout the 2d of Peter and 2d and 3d of John, a striking independence of each other, and but few instances of resemblance; and these few may have arisen from a third Syriac text with which both translators were acquainted, or from some gloss, several having crept into the MS. of Erpenius.

Yet, in these portions of the New Testament, the Arabic text of Erpenius departs so far from the strict sense of the Greek, that we must admit that the translator saw the Greek dialect only through some medium, and consequently has given its meaning with less force and exactness. It is probable, therefore, that the Epistles in question were translated into the Arabic from some Syriac version hitherto undiscovered.<sup>1</sup>

The Apocalypse in the Erpenian edition is an essentially different version from that in the Polyglot; yet such resemblances are sometimes found between the two that we cannot but suppose one of the two translators to have been acquainted with the work of the other. The Syriac Apocalypse, which is found at the end of the Peschito, was not the source whence this Arabic version was derived. Thus much we readily perceive from comparison; but it is not so easy to name the real source.

### § 102.

We have hitherto avoided speaking of the four Gospels, not in order to get rid of the subject entirely, but to devote attention to it in a more convenient place. Erpenius, as we have said, had a peculiar text of the Gospels in his MS., which was by no means derived from the old Syriac version. They were translated, as the subscription at the end of them testifies, from the Coptic; or rather they were amended by a Copt, named Nesiulaman, the son of Azalkefat.

It may be regarded as accidental that the Gospels according to another version were appended to this Syriaco-Arabic New Testament; but it is worthy of remark that an Arabic MS. of the New Testament, *Cod. Or.* n. 43 in the Royal Library at Vienna, the Epistles in which were, as the fragments remaining evince, translated from the Peschito, contains the Gospels, not according to the Syriac, but exactly like those which Erpenius found in his Leyden Codex.

A Paris MS. exhibits to us the old Syriac text of the Gospels with an Arabic version by its side. Here we might reasonably expect to find an Arabic translation from the Peschito. The learned man who has discussed and accurately described this document,<sup>2</sup> did indeed, at first, believe that he had discovered an Arabic version which was essentially different from the preceding, but on closer examination abandoned this

<sup>1</sup> This text of the Catholic Epistles was reprinted in "Johannis Epist. Catholic., Arab. et Æthiop. Lugd. Bat. 1654. 4to. "Jacobi Epistola Arab. et Æthiop." and "Judæ Ep. Arab. Æthiop." in the same year and at the same place. Comp. Schnurrer, Biblioth. Arab. P. VI. p. 26.

<sup>2</sup> Gottlob Christ. Storr, Observ. super N. T. versionibus Syriac. Stuttgart, 1772. 8vo. P. I. § 12. p. 21.



position, and afterwards announced that these Gospels differed but slightly and accidentally from the printed text.<sup>1</sup>

These facts cannot at least be considered as presaging the supposed existence of an *Arabic version of the Gospels from the Syriac text*; and I do not believe that any such ever existed.<sup>2</sup>

I am confirmed in this, particularly, by the Carshuni New Testament. It is well known that the Syrians retained very long their national alphabet, or rather that they did not adopt the alterations which its characters underwent in the hands of the Arabians. Though for a long time they read the Bible in the Arabic version, they always wrote it in Syriac letters, like their other church-documents, and many even yet adhere to this custom. Such MSS. are called, howsoever the term may have originated, Carshuni.

Now if the Syriac Church ever possessed an Arabic version of their own of the Gospels, we should expect to find it in MSS. written in their church-characters and appearing as church-documents. Whoever, with this view, opens the Carshuni New Testament, which was printed at the Propaganda-press in Rome for the use of the Maronites,<sup>3</sup> must be very much surprised to find in it the text of Erpenius; and yet it is really so, as I have satisfied myself by a comparison of several chapters of Mark.

The MS. which the editors followed was brought from the island of Cyprus to Rome by Michael Metoscita. They had, as they say in their preface, several MSS. at hand, but gave the preference to this on account of its accuracy.<sup>4</sup> It seems that nearly a hundred years before, the excellent John Baptist Raimundi determined to publish a Carshuni New Testament. He went so far as to write out a fair copy of it from three MSS. which were in the college of the Maronites. These preparations, together with the MSS. themselves which were the basis of them, were undoubtedly in the possession of those to whom the Propaganda entrusted the business.<sup>5</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Id. Dissert. Inaug. Crit. de Evangeliiis Arabicis. Tubingæ. 1775. 4to. § 26. p. 37.

<sup>2</sup> Richard Simon (Hist. Crit. des versions du N. T. Chap. 18,) gives us an account of a Syriac and Arabic MS. of the four Gospels, in the Library of the King of France, marked 285. *Cod. Syr.* "But," says he, "the copyist transcribed only a few chapters of the Arabic, in the beginning." The Syriac Gospels with the number mentioned are yet in the Royal Library, and are marked according to the new arrangement, *Codd. Syr. n.* 16. But there is no appearance in the MS. of an Arabic version. There is, indeed, prefixed in the Arabic language, an account of the revision of the MS. in 1671, by one Peter of Aleppo; and Simon seems to have hastily taken this for the Arabic, "vis-à-vis des premières sections" of the Syriac text.

<sup>3</sup> This book was described above among the editions of the Peschito (N. 15). I first saw it in the Royal Library at Vienna, and afterwards procured it at Rome. One column of each page contains the text of the Peschito; the other the Carshuni. It is clear that it exhibits in the Acts of the Apostles and the Epistles, the Arabic version made from the Syriac. Even in the 2d of Peter, 2d and 3d of John, and the Epistle of Jude, the text agrees with the Erpenian, as also in the Apocalypse, though here there are more frequent variations.

<sup>4</sup> Præfat. ad N. T. Carsh. "Et hanc (versionem), quæ in præsentî Syriacis characteribus in lucem prodit, Romam detulit ex Cypri insula Michael Metoscita, quæ ceteris, quas præ manibus habuimus, correctior est, et emendatior."

<sup>5</sup> Lami, De eruditione Apostolorum. P. II. Sect. III. § 1. p. 883—885.

This induction, I conceive, is sufficient to justify me in positively denying the existence of an Arabic version of the Gospels from the Peschito. The very fact which will probably be objected against me, favors my position. In the Library at Leyden is a Codex, containing the commentaries of Abulpharagius Abdallaz-Ben-al-Thib on Matthew. The text of Matthew, on which the commentary is composed, is certainly a translation from the Syriac; and therefore here is an Arabic Gospel according to the Peschito. True; but the learned man who, in particular, informs us of this fact, likewise informs us that this version, as is evident from its character and from the commentary which accompanies it, was composed by the commentator himself, who lived in the 11th century. Till this period, then, there were no Arabic Gospels from the Syriac in existence; for otherwise the commentator would not have thought it necessary to compose a translation himself.<sup>1</sup>

### *Arabic Version from the Coptic.*

#### § 103.

The Christians under the patriarchate of Alexandria, like their brethren in other countries, when they felt the want of an Arabic version of the Bible, made one from their old church-version. In many libraries are found Coptic MSS. with an Arabic version by their side.

I once had an opportunity of examining one of the finest of them certainly, containing the four Gospels. It has gone with other literary treasures from Rome to Paris, where it now is. It was formerly *Vaticanus Codex Copt. Arab. No. 9*, on cotton paper, in folio. The Coptic text, properly speaking, occupies the page; the Arabic is only permitted to occupy a small column at the side. The title-page is splendid, decorated with gold letters and embellishments. The initial letters too, throughout, are of gold, and ingeniously executed. A note subjoined makes grateful mention of its owner, who presented it to the Vatican Library: "Jo. Bapt. Raymundus Bibliothecæ Vaticanæ dono dedit ex testamento A. 1614."

This Arabic version likewise of the Gospels is not essentially different from the text of Erpenius. I have made a comparison as to a few chapters in Luke, and perceive that all their variations from each other are merely various readings of one and the same version.

But the Epistles of Paul are in a peculiar version, different from any now known. I discovered this from the beautiful Coptico-Arabic MS. in the French Library, *No. 17*, formerly *Cod. 332. Epist. Paul. Copt. Arab.*, on cotton paper in folio. For proof of this I will here present the first eleven verses of the Epistle to Philemon; an acceptable present, I trust, to the friends of biblical literature, which may convince them of the truth of my assertion.

<sup>1</sup> Gottl. Chr. Storr, Dissert. inaugural. crit. de Evang. Arab. § 34. p. 43, 44.

من بولس اسير يسوع المسيح وظموتاوس الاخ الي  
 فيلمون حبيبنا وشريكنا في العمل 2. وانغيا الاخت  
 وارخيغوس شريكنا في جنديّة وجماعة بينهم 3.  
 النعمة لكم والسلامة من الله ابينا ومن ربنا يسوع  
 المسيح 4. انا اشكر الله في كل حين واذكرك  
 في صلواتي 5. ان اسمع من اجل محبتك وامانتك  
 هذه التي لك في يسوع المسيح وفي جميع الاطهار 6.  
 لكي تكون شركة امانتك تعمل في معرفة كل خير  
 هذه الي فينا الي المسيح 7. لانني نلت فرح عظيم  
 وعزاً محبتك لان تتحنن الاطهار استراح من حبتك  
 ايها الاخ 8. من اجل هذا الي الدلال عظيم بالرّب  
 ان امرّك بما يجب 9. من اجل المحبة خاصّة  
 اطلب اليك وانا واحد هكذا بولس الشيخ واسير  
 يسوع المسيح 10. الان اطلب اليك من اجل هذا  
 الذي والدته في اعنغاذي اناسيموس 11. هذا الذي  
 كان غير بافعالك زمانا والا هو بافعالي ولك :

This version, which, like the Syro-Arabic, was not made from the Greek, can never be used in deciding as to readings of the latter; but, as it is superfluous to remind the critic, it can only serve to aid a decision in doubtful cases as to the readings of the Coptic text, in like manner as the Syro-Arabic may in regard to readings of the Peschito. To a person who should undertake a critical investigation and a new edition of the Peschito, or of the Coptic versions, both of these Arabic translations would be of great service.

v. 2. Other MSS. ἀγαπητῇ; but ADEFG and Copt. ἀδελφῇ.

v. 6. Other MSS. ἐν ὑμῖν; but AC and Vat. 1210, ἐν ἡμῖν. The word Ἰησοῦν is omitted, as in AC, and Copt.

v. 7. χαρὰν, AC and Copt. Other MSS. χάριν.

*Further Investigation of the Gospels in particular.*

## § 104.

That the Syrians had no other Arabic Gospels than those which Erpenius has published, we have proved by many arguments. But these same were current among the Copts, as we learn from the Vatican MS. The very MS. followed by Erpenius had in reality been revised by a Copt, as is shown by the subscription at the end of the Gospels which runs thus: "*Absoluta est hujus libri descriptio die 16 mensis Baunæ, anni nongentesimi octogesimi octavi martyrum justorum. Descriptus autem est codex ex emendatissimo exemplari, cujus descriptor ait, se id descripsisse ex alio exemplari emendato, exarato manu Johannis Episcopi Cophtitæ; qui Johannes dicit, se suum descripsisse ex exemplari emendatissimo, quod ediderat D. Nesiulaman F. Azelkefati.*"

And yet these Gospels were not translated either from the Coptic or Syriac, but from the Greek. This can be seen in part from the order of the words, which was retained like that of the Greek so far as possible, even in such constructions and transpositions of words as violate the rules of Arabic syntax. It may be seen further from the etymologies which the author too anxiously strove to exhibit: e. g. in the word *τειράρχης*, which has a peculiarly bad effect in Luke 3: 1; *διχοιομήσει*, Matt. 24: 51; *ὑπερηγανία*, Mark 7: 22; *ἐνσχήμων*, Mark 15: 43; *συμφωνία*, Luke 15: 25; *πολιτής*, Luke 15: 15; which the translator

derived from *πολύς* and rendered *كثير*. It is further proved by the erroneous divisions of words, mistaken separations of the clauses, and changes of expressions: e. g. Matt. 22: 4, where the author read *ΚΑΙ ΤΑΣΙΤΙΣΤΑ* continuously thus: *ΚΑΤΑΣΙΤΙΣΤΟΙ*; Mark 4: 19, where he separated *ΕΙΣΠΟΡΕΤΟΜΕΝΟΙ* into *ΟΙΣ* or *ΑΙΣ—ΠΟΡΕΤΟΜΕΝΟΙ*; Matt. 25: 21, where he made the construction to be *δοῦλε ἀγαθὲ, καὶ πιστὸς ἐπὶ ὀλίγα ἡς, πιστὸν ἐπὶ πολλῶν σε καταστήσω*; and Matt. 23: 24, where he mistook *ΑΙΤΑΙΖΟΝΤΕΣ τὸν κῶνωπα* for *ΑΙΛΑΙΠΟΝΤΕΣ*.

This version of the Gospels from the Greek was, as we have seen, adopted by the Syrians as their church-version, and for this purpose altered to such a degree of conformity with their ancient church-version, the Peschito, that it might appear in MSS. by its side and be considered as a Syro-Arabic text.

It met with similar honour and similar fortune among the Copts. It was modified according to their ancient church-version so as not to differ, at least strikingly, from the readings and peculiarities of the latter.

Who it was that regulated the Arabico-Coptic text we know not. Perhaps it was Nesiulaman, the son of Azalkefat, whose merits in relation to the text in Egypt were better known formerly than now, when we have only very indefinite information respecting him from the sub-



scription to the Leyden Codex. With respect to the Arabico-Syriac Gospels, there is or was current among the Syrians an account, which at any rate serves to show when the want of them was felt. John, patriarch of the Jacobites, is said to have been urged, about the year 640 of our reckoning, even by an Arabian magistrate of the province, to translate the four Gospels from the Syriac into Arabic.<sup>1</sup> Hence the alteration of these Gospels according to the Peschito may have been made under this patriarch.

Now, as neither church made a version of its own of the Gospels, but merely altered and accommodated one already in existence made from the Greek, so as to make it correspond with the Coptic and Syriac versions and proper to be placed by their side, it is clear that these Arabic Gospels must have been of more ancient origin, long previously held in regard and esteem.

These ancient Gospels, which were executed from a Greek copy, were (difficult as it is in the present state to determine definitely what Recension they follow) certainly not derived from a MS. of the Hesychian or Egyptian text. So much can be asserted with safety from a general investigation of them. Yet Arabia proper, Djezirat al Arab, is said to have received its MSS. together with Christianity from Egypt.

We are therefore led to seek for the origin of this version, or its primeval seat, out of the Arabian peninsula; viz. among those Arabs who lived under petty princes in the south east and north east of Palestine. These Saracens, as they are called by the Greek writers, were prevailed upon by Greek negotiations, on occasion of a war under Valens in the last half of the fourth century, to embrace Christianity.<sup>2</sup> The Christian teachers now certainly had need of Arabic Gospels, and they were translated from Constantinopolitan or Palestinian MSS., which are the basis of the text we are discussing.

Whether my hypotheses as to the time and place when and where these Gospels originated be adopted or rejected, it must at any rate be conceded that they were in existence when the Syrians and Copts began to feel the want of an Arabic version of the Bible. If I am asked why these two churches did not proceed in the same way as to the other books of the New Testament, and accommodate an older Arabic version of the Acts and Epistles, likewise, to the Peschito or the Coptic text, of several replies I might make the shortest, viz. that only the Gospels had been translated. I might reply too, that the two facts really exist together and are correct, whether all the questions which may be raised respecting them can be answered or not.

<sup>1</sup> Assemani Biblioth. Orient. Tom. III. P. II. p. 599.

<sup>2</sup> Socrat. Hist. Eccl. IV. 36. Theodoret. H. Eccl. IV. 23. Sozomen. VI. 39.

*History of the text of these Gospels.*

## § 105.

In this way originated three different classes of MSS. of the Gospels containing at bottom one and the same version. This circumstance was detrimental to the text. The copyists, who were obliged in the Arabic more than any other language to collate several copies, gradually confounded the three. They naturally did not scruple to amend one MS. from another, or to transfer readings from one to another, as they perceived in the main but a single version. Hence arose by degrees a mixed text.

This happened especially in the book of Matthew; for in the beginning of their work the ardor of the copyists was greatest. The MS. followed by the Roman edition of 1591 deviated most from the Leyden Codex and the others which Erpenius used in the first thirteen chapters of Matthew, as he observes in the Preface to his New Testament. I have in my own possession a very neat MS. of the Arabic Gospels in 16mo. which, even some chapters further onward in this Evangelist, continues to vary in a marked manner from the Erpenian text.

A MS. of the Gospels, marked No. XXVII in the Library of France, in large octavo, deviates further from the Erpenian text in some chapters of Matthew which I have compared than in Luke. It is, however, remarkable in this respect, that it attests the procedure of the Arabic copyists and the want of consideration with which they have confounded different texts. In a postscript at the end the copyist says, that he presents a MS. amended and improved by a collation of the best *Syriac*,

*Romaic*, and *Arabic copies*. His words are: النسخة محررة  
علي عنده نسخ كريمة سريانية ورومية وقبطية  
وعربية واعتمدت حقاقتنا من النسخ المذكورة علي  
ما ثبت صحته وترك منها ما ثبت سقمه

He then—etc. confirms his declaration by examples which it is not necessary to quote.

This procedure is clearly shown in a MS. in the Royal Library at Vienna, *Codd. Or. N. 43*, which seems to have once comprised the whole New Testament, of which, however, besides the Gospels, only a few fragments of the two Epistles to the Corinthians remain. Lambecius has criticised it in the first book of his commentary under the number 34; and from this Peter Kirsten compiled his “*Notæ in Evangelium Matthæi, Breslæ 1611.*”

The Gospels of this MS. are filled over the lines and in the margin with numerous readings, the sources of which are usually pointed out thus—such a MS.—or, in red ink, *the Coptic, the Syriac, the Roman*. It is uncertain whether Greek or Latin MSS. are meant by the

last denomination. With these, there is almost always a diacritical sign which refers these notes to the word or passage to which they relate. But the value of this precious MS. does not consist merely in evincing the endeavor of the copyist to draw together readings from various copies, and supply his less discreet brethren with extremely heterogeneous materials, which they often afterwards smelted into one mass. Its peculiar value consists in the aid it will furnish any one who may hereafter undertake to extricate the ancient Arabic Gospels from their present involved condition, free them from every thing foreign, and restore them to their original state. In such an irksome task, this MS. will serve to distinguish the foreign additions, to designate their origin, and guide the procedure of the critic.

For this use, moreover, a MS. in the Library *a la Minerva* (N. IV. 191) at Rome would seem to be adapted; for its postscript boasts that it was corrected from one of the purest and best copies, and begs and beseeches the reader not to permit any change in the reading.<sup>1</sup>

## EDITIONS OF THE GOSPELS.

## § 106.

We have mentioned as yet no text of the Gospels but the Erpenian; they were printed, however, still earlier at Rome, (in 1590,) we know not from what MS., with the title: "*Evangelium sanctum Domini nostri Jesu Christi conscriptum a quatuor Evangelistis sanctis, id est, a Matthæo, Marco, Luca, et Johanne. Romæ in typograph. Medicea. MDXC.*" fol. At the end is the date MDXCI. In the same year they appeared again from the same press with an interlineary Latin text; some copies with the title, "*Sanctum Dei Evangelium Arab. Lat.,*" and some without any title. On the last page but one the printer (*Typographus lectori,*) gives an account of the amendments made by him in this edition. Beneath this stand the words: "*Romæ in Typogr. Medicea, MDXCI.*" In 1619, this edition, provided with a new title, was sold as a new work; and in 1774 again a second time.<sup>2</sup>

In 1645 the Gospels were inserted in the Paris Polyglot, from the second Roman edition, with some alterations by Sionita.<sup>3</sup>

Walton, according to his own admission, took the text contained in the 5th volume of the London Polyglot from the Paris Polyglot.<sup>4</sup>

In accordance with this derivation of the editions, we have properly

<sup>1</sup> J. M. A. Scholz, *Biblisch-Kritische Reise*. p. 133, 134.

<sup>2</sup> A history and description of this edition is carefully given in Chr. Frid. Schnurrer's "*Biblioth. Arab. P. VI. Tubing. 1805.*" 4to. and afterwards in his more complete work, "*Biblioth. Arabica. Halæ. 1811.*" 8vo. Class. V. n. 318.

<sup>3</sup> This we learn partly from the printer of this Polyglot, "*e scripto Antonii Vitre in Gabriele Sionitam anno 1640. Parisiis excuso,*" (from which Le Long made extracts in his description of the Polyglot,) and partly from Rich. Simon's *Hist. Crit. des Vers. du N. T.* c. 8.

<sup>4</sup> Walton's *Proleg.* V. § 4. n. 9. XIV. § 17. p. 35, 36.

but three principal impressions taken immediately from MSS.; viz. the Roman, the Erpenian and the Carshuni. We were first informed of the agreement between the Roman and Erpenian text by a little essay which has contributed much to a better acquaintance with the Arabic Gospels.<sup>1</sup>

### § 107.

We have lately come to the knowledge of an Arabic version of the Gospels and Pauline Epistles, and in fact (although on this point the account is not sufficiently clear,) of the whole New Testament, made from the Greek.<sup>2</sup> This version (*Cod. Vatic. Arab. 13.*) stands, in a philological point of view, far below those before known. In observing the plan on which its author proceeded, we cannot estimate the value of this work very highly. He frequently omits at pleasure one and even several words; adds, likewise, one or more words without scruple; and sometimes deviates into unnecessary circumlocutions. The last case occurs in the Gospels more frequently than in the Epistles; and on this account the latter are of most critical value. The passages, Matt. 13: 1—22, Mark 5: 20—28, and the Epistle to Philemon, which, with some others, are presented us as specimens, afford proof of this.

The additions we will designate by a hyphen. Matt. 13: 7, ἀκάνθαι-περὶ αὐτά. 8, καρπὸν-καλόν. 13, οὐ βλέπουσι-καὶ συνιοῦσι. 15, τοῦ λαοῦ τούτου-οὐδὲ ἀκούσουσι τοῖς ὡσὶν αὐτῶν. 19, ἐσπαρμένον-λόγον. 20, τὸν λόγον ἀκούων-ὅταν αὐτὸν ἀκούσῃ. Mark 5: 20, καὶ πάντες-οἱ ἀκούοντες ταῦτα. Philemon 1: 1, ἀγαπητῶ-τέκνῳ. 22, ἅμα-ἔγραψά σοι. He omits ἔρχεται in Matt. 13: 2, unless, يفتن (perhaps, it should be يفتن) be meant for it. In Mark 5: 21, he overlooked πάλιν εἰς τὸ πέραν; v. 23, πολλά is not expressed. Phil. v. 6, τοῦ ἐν ἡμῖν or ὑμῖν is wanting; v. 10, ἐμου τέκνον is omitted; and v. 22, ἐτοιμάξέ μοι ξενίαν likewise. There are the following unnecessary circumlocutions in Mark 5: 23; for καὶ παρεκάλει, فاجعل يطلب مريضة شديدة الحال, and for ἐσχάτως ἔχει, مريضة قد أشرفت على الموت.

Several words are twice translated, unless they have been added as interpolations. Matt. 13: 5, καὶ ἐξανέτειλε فرسخ وصهر (rather 14, συνῆτε يفتنهم and يفتكرون; ἴδτε يبصرون and يعملون: 20, μετὰ χαρᾶς سرور and فرح: Mark 5: 20, صنع and

<sup>1</sup> Dissert. Inaug. Crit. de Evangeliiis Arabicis. "Auct. Gottl. Christ. Storr. Tübingæ 1775. 4to.

<sup>2</sup> Dr. J. M. Augustin Scholz, "Biblisch-Kritische Reise. Leipz. 1823. p. 117—126. The Greek postscript to the version, of which we shall speak hereafter, mentions the four Gospels, the Acts of the Apostles, seven Catholic, and fourteen Pauline Epistles. The Apocalypse is not mentioned.



اذنعم : Philem. 21, ὑπὲρ ὃ, افضل and أكثر; 22, ἐλπίζω . . . χα-  
ρισθήσομαι, انهب أجروان (probably اوهب [ارجوان] and اعصا لكم).

Dr. Scholz, who brought to light the existence of this version, and has presented to the public some passages from it, reckons it among the MSS. of the Constantinopolitan text, and perceives no trace of Egyptian relationship in it. For some reason or other, the proofs which he selects from the passages presented sustain precisely the contrary. In Mark 5: 22, it omits ἰδού, as do BDL, *Copt.*, while all the Constantinopolitan MSS. read it. In Luke 4: 8, it wants, with BDL, *Copt.*, ὑπάγε ὀπίσω μου, Σατανᾶ, differing from the Constantinopolitan MSS. In 1 Tim. 3: 16, the Constantinopolitan MSS. generally agree in reading θεὸς ἐφανερώθη; the Alexandrian read ὅς, as does this Arabic version الذي أدι. If God is spoken of in this verse, the Arabic word does not express ὅς ἐφανερώθη, but refers to ἐνσεβεία, piety, خشية الله; but at any rate the ὅς is plainly there, الذي. In

Philem. v. 2, ἀγαπητῇ is Constantinopolitan; the Arab. version reads ἀδελφῇ with ADEFG, *Copt.* In Philem. v. 7. χάριν, Constantinopolitan; χαράν our version and ACDEFG, *Copt.*: v. 12, ἔπεμψα, Const.; ἐπεμψά σοι, our Arab. version and ACDE, *Copt.*: v. 20, σπλάγχνα . . . ἐν κυρίῳ, Const.; our version, ἐν Χριστῷ, with ACDEFG, *Copt.*: v. 23, ἀσπάζονται, Const.; our version, ἀσπάζεται, with ACDE, *Copt.*

Further, Dr. Scholz is of opinion that the version was probably used in the churches in Palestine. On what he founds this probability he has not told us.<sup>1</sup> This is the more extraordinary as the Greek postscript which is appended to the version, and which he himself lays before us, might have informed him of the place of its origin. It was Hems, "Εμῖσα or "Εμεσα, as it is variously written by the ancients. Βίβλος γὰρ εἰμι . . . εὐαγγελιστῶν τὰς θάλασσας . . . φέρουσα πιστοῦ Δανιὴλ Φιλεντόλου, γόνου τελοῦντος Γαβριὴλ Φιλοκάλου λαμπρᾶς Ἑμίσσης αὐτοῦ οὔσης πατρίδος, κ. τ. λ. The writer of this postscript was Karikos, a deacon, who probably added in Greek the facts and lessons. The calligraphist of the Arabic text signs his name Justas Ben Leun, Ben Abilwalid. Hence Daniel Philentolos was probably the original translator, whose son, Gabriel Philokalos, entirely completed the work (γόνου τελοῦντος Γαβριὴλ) at Emesa, his native place.

*The Arabic Acts of the Apostles, Epistles and Apocalypse  
contained in the Polyglots.*

§ 108.

We should not have known from what source the editors of the Paris Polyglot obtained these portions of it, had it not been incidentally stated

<sup>1</sup> Dr. Scholz. "Biblich-Kritische Reise," p. 126, 127, and 175. Outlines of a history of the text.

by the printer, Antony Vitré. From him we learn that the MS. from which they were edited came from Aleppo.<sup>1</sup>

Yet they were translated directly from the Greek, as is shown by various appearances which could have originated in no other way. E. g. in Acts 19: 9, where a man named Tyrannus is mentioned, the translator renders *Τυράννου τίνος* by *أحد الكبر*; in Acts 1: 20, he

mistook *ἐπαυλις αὐτοῦ* for *ἡ πόλις αὐτοῦ*, *مدينته*; in Acts 12: 13, he translates the proper name *Ρόδη*, *وردة*; in Acts 21: 1, he

read *εἰς Σάρδα* for *ΕΙΣΠΑΤΑΡΑ*; in Acts 28: 11, he renders *ἐν πλοίῳ παραχειμακότι ἐν τῇ νήσῳ Ἀλεξανδρίῳ, παρασήμῳ Διοσκοῦροις* thus: *with a ship which had wintered with an Alexandrian, named Dioscorides*. Some of the cases in which the Greek was incorrectly divided or pointed by him are: Acts 15: 17, where *ὁ ποιῶν ταῦτα πάντα γνωστά* is read continuously, and then the following sentence begins thus: *ἀπ' αἰῶνός ἐστι τῷ θεῷ π. τ. ἔ. α. from the beginning God's works belonged to him*; Acts 19: 35, 36, where the first clause ends with *Ἀρτέμιδος*, and *καὶ τοῦ Διοπειτοῦς* is connected with *ἀναντιρρόγητων* and rendered: *and if we had fallen down from Heaven, we could not contradict this*; Acts 20: 15, where the words *ἐν Τρωγυλλίῳ τῇ ἐχομένῃ*, are connected together and rendered: *situated near Trogylhum*. The translation of the words *Ἀρτεμεις*, in 19: 24,

*Ἐρμης*, and *Ζεὺς*, 14: 12, *المشتري*, *الزهره عطارد*, and many

others, shows that the author had the Greek words before him.

The same is the case, likewise, in the Epistles. In 2 Cor. 6: 14, *μὴ γίνεσθε ἐτεροζυγοῦντες τοῖς ἀπίστοις*, a singular etymology is attributed to *ἐτεροζυγοῦντες*, *YOUR SCALES should not incline towards unbelievers*. A similar one, too, occurs in 2 Cor. 6: 5, *ἐν ἀκαταστασίαις*, *in want of places to lodge in*. There is a more serious mistake in Gal. 4: 25, *συνοικεῖ τῇ Ἱερουσαλὴμ*, *it borders on Jerusalem*. The expression, *κατὰ ἄνθρωπον*, in 1 Cor. 15: 32, is falsely rendered, *as becomes a man*, &c. In 2 Cor. 10: 16, *ὑπερέκεινα* is confounded with *ὑπερκείμενα*, and *ἔτοιμα* with *ἐντιμα*; and, in the preceding verse, *κόποις* is translated as *τόποις*. True, the reading *κόποις*, likewise, is in the text, but it came in subsequently from another source; for the mistakes as to the words *ὑπερέκεινα* and *ἔτοιμα* arose in part from *τόποις*, and hence *ὑπερκείμενα* and *ἐντιμα* came to be rendered, *PLACES situated high above your country and precious*. In 2 Cor. 10: 13, *κατὰ τὸ μέτρον τοῦ κανῶνος*, the Greek word itself, *κανών*, is retained, *فانون كعقد*. In the Epistle of Jude, v. 12, *οὗτοι*

*εἰσιν ἐν ταῖς ἀγάπαις αὐτῶν σπιλάδες, συνενοχούμενοι*, the translator takes *ἀγάπαι* to mean *courtesans* or *prostitutes*, as though he read *ἀγαπηταῖς*; and *συνενοχούμενοι* is solicitously translated by three

<sup>1</sup> His words are, according to Le Long's citation: "Arabici textus quatuor Evangelia cum Latinâ translatione juxta Romanum exemplar a. 1591, et reliqua N. T. ex codice Mspto. quam ex Aleppo adduci curaverat R. P. Joseph Carmelita, adornata sunt."

words: *These are they who place their prostitutes with them at feasts.* In Rev. 2: 5, ἔργα τῶν Νικολαϊτῶν is rendered, *works of the conquerors*, اَتْفَالُ الْعِنَاكِي. In 14: 9, ΘΥΜΟΥ was mistaken for ΘΑΝΑΤΟΥ, a mistake which was the more easy as the last word is frequently abbreviated in MSS. into ΘΝΤΟΥ.

## § 109.

These portions of the New Testament were translated by a different person from him who made the version of the Gospels. The style is dissimilar in a great many respects. I will show this at least in one point, viz. the use of certain words. In the Gospels, for ἔστι or οὐκ ἔστι, the expression, مَا كَانَ يَحْلُ — كَانَ يَحْلُ, *it is solved or it is not solved*, is invariably used, (Matt. 12: 2, 10. 14: 4. 19: 3. Mark 2: 24. 3: 4. 10: 2. 12: 14. Luke 6: 2, 4. etc.) This is not the case in the Acts and Epistles, where for the most part the expression مَطْلُف, or مَحْكُن is employed. (Acts 22: 25. 21: 37. 2: 29. 1 Cor. 6: 12. 10: 23. 2 Cor. 12: 4.) In the Gospels, ἐκατόνταρχος is always, فَايْدُ الْمَائِيَّة (Matt. 8: 5, 9. 13: 27. Luke 7: 2, 6) and in the Acts, رِيْدِيْسُ الْمَائِيَّة (10: 1, 22. 24: 31.) In the Acts στρατηγὸς τοῦ ἔθρου is جَنْدُ الْهَيْكَل in the Gospels. In the Gospels βιβλος is always كِتَاب or سَفَر; in the Acts and Epistles it is the word consecrated by Abubeker to the Koran, مَصْحَف (Acts 1: 20. 17: 42. 19: 19. Gal. 3: 10. Philipp. 4: 3. Heb. 9: 19.) In the Gospels νόμος is always نَامُوس; in the Acts and Epistles, شَرِيعَة. (Rom. 5: 13. seq. Philipp. 3: 6, 9. 1 Tim. 1: 8. Heb. 7: 12. James 2: 12. Acts 15: 24.) In the Gospels διάβολος is أَبْلِيْس; in the Acts and Epistles, الْمَحَال. (Eph. 6: 11. 2 Tim. 2: 26. 1 Peter 5: 8. 1 John 3: 8. Acts 10: 38. 13: 10.) etc.

The Acts of the Apostles, the Pauline and Catholic Epistles, as we see in part from the similar use of the expressions just cited, are by the same translator. I cannot venture to include the Apocalypse in this assertion. The common origin of the Acts and Epistles, however, is evinced by a similarity in language and in the mode of translation, by the custom of throwing light on difficult passages by means of paraphrase, (Acts 16: 2. 15: 20. 18: 15. 1 Cor. 5: 10. Rom. 6: 5, 16. 14: 9 etc.) and the circumstance that this license is united with careful fidelity, and with a special solicitude in rendering words compounded with μετά, σύν, and especially with πρό, which last is expressed by قَدْ م, سَلَف, and frequently by سَبَق. (Acts 2: 25, προωρώμην, سَبَقَتْ فَرَأَيْت; 31,

προιδών, سبق فعرف; Rom. 1: 2, προεπηγγείλατο, سبق فوعد;  
2 Peter 3: 16, προγινωσκοντες, سبقتم فعرفتتم.)

The text of this version has not escaped foreign additions. We frequently find the same word twice translated, and even short clauses twice rendered in different language. These repetitions can hardly have belonged to this version originally, but must have been adopted afterwards from other MSS. (E. g. Acts 15: 15, 28. 16: 37, 39. 21: 11, 13, 27.) In Acts 18: 7, to ὀνόματι Ἰούστου the word *Τίτου* has been added, from the Arabico-Syriac version. Other examples are Rom. 6: 21, 23. 12: 8. 13: 5. 14: 20, etc. Among these later interpolations must be reckoned, likewise, the word *الأفريقية* which is appended to *Ἰταλίας* in Acts 18: 2, and might otherwise lead us astray in regard to this version; for then it would be necessary to bring it down to the times of the crusades, in which Europeans generally, except the Greeks, were termed in the East and in Africa, Franks. The Apocalypse, concerning which it is very uncertain whether or not it is to be considered as a part of the same version, was translated from a MS. which had been interpolated from the Scholia of Andreas of Cappadocia. (Rev. 1: 2—5. 2: 16.)

## § 110.

The country in which this version originated is stated, very unexpectedly, by the author himself. In Acts II d Luke, enumerating the different lands from which the people came who were in Jerusalem at Pentecost, mentions (v. 9,) *τὰ μέρη τῆς Αἰθύης τῆς κατὰ Κυρήνην*, which our translator renders thus: *أفريقية وذواحي التي*

*كورنتا*, the region of Africa in which our country lies. We may now be convinced that the reading *Al Franjia*, which occurs with the word Italy in Acts 18: 2, was of later origin than the version itself. For who would expect to find so accurate a knowledge of the Greek in Cyrenaica in the times of the crusades?

## § 111.

The Acts of the Apostles and Epistles were translated from a MS. of the Constantinopolitan Recension. We will give a single specimen of each.

Acts II.		
LUCIAN.		HESYCHIUS.
7. λέγοντες πρὸς ἀλλήλους	Arab.	λέγοντες
17. ἐνύπνια	Arab.	ἐνυπνίους
20. πρὶν ἢ	Arab.	πρὶν
23. ἔκδοτ. λαβόντες διὰ χειρῶν	Arab.	ἔκδοτ. διὰ χειρός
30. ὁσφύος αὐτοῦ, τὸ κατὰ σάρκα ἀναστήσειν τὸν Χριστὸν, καθίσαι	} Arab.	ὁσφύος αὐτοῦ καθίσαι



31. κατελείφθη ἡ ψυχὴ αὐτοῦ εἰς ἄδου	Arab.	ἐγκαταλείφθη εἰς ἄδου.
33. ὁ νῦν ὑμεῖς βλ.	Arab.	ὁ ὑμεῖς βλ.
41. ἀσμένως ἀποδεξάμενοι	Arab.	ἀποδεξάμενοι
43. ἀποστόλων ἐγίνετο	Arab.	{ ἀποστόλων ἐγίνετο ἐν Ἱερουσαλήμ φόβος δὲ ἦν μέγας ἐπὶ πάντας, καὶ
47. καθ' ἡμέραν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ	Arab.	καθ' ἡμέραν.

## 1st Epistle to the Corinthians, VII. Chap.

## LUCIAN.

## HESYCHIUS.

3. ὀφειλομένην εὖνοίαν	Ar.	ὀφειλὴν
5. τῇ νηστείᾳ καὶ τῇ προσευχῇ	Ar.	τῇ προσευχῇ
ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ συνέρχεσθε	Ar.	ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ ἦτε
13. ἀφίετω αὐτόν	Ar.	ἀφίετω τὸν ἄνδρα
14. ἄπιστος ἐν τῷ ἀνδρὶ	Ar.	ἄπιστος ἐν τῷ ἀδελφῷ
17. ἐμέρισ. ὁ θεός	Ar.	ἐμέρισ. ὁ κύριος
κέκληκ. ὁ κύριος	Ar.	κέκληκ. ὁ θεός
22. ὁμοίως καὶ ὁ ἐλεύθ.	Ar.	ὁμοίως ὁ ἐλεύθ.
34. μεμέρισται καὶ ἡ γυνὴ ἡ παρθένος ἡ ἄγαμος	Ar.	{ καὶ μεμέρισται καὶ ἡ γυνὴ ἡ ἄγαμος καὶ ἡ παρθένος ἡ ἄγαμος
μεριμνᾷ		{ μεριμνᾷ
37. ἐδραῖος ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ	Ar.	τῇ καρδίᾳ αὐτοῦ ἐδραῖος

This text, which first appeared in the Paris Polyglot, was reprinted in Walton's. The edition of the English Bible Society (الكتب المقدسة وهي كتب العهد العتيق والعهد الجديد in 1811, 4to maj.) has repeated it as respects the New Testament. I know not whether it was amended by the aid of MSS. or not.

## § 112.

The Arabic edition of the Bible which is said to have appeared at Bucharest in 1700 is now unknown; as also another which Athanasius, Bishop of Antioch, Patriarch of the Melchites, caused to be printed at Aleppo in 1708, which I have sought in vain in all the great libraries I have visited.

The Arabic New Testament printed at London in 1717 in 4to., under the superintendence of Salomo Negri, was (according to Michaelis, *Einleit. ins N. T. I. Th.* § 67. p. 453. 4th ed.) printed from the English Polyglot, with some alterations according to the Greek.

In the Chronicon of Dorotheus, metropolitan of Monembasia, (in vulgar Greek, Venice 1778, 4to.) we find it stated in the section (p. 424) *Περὶ τοῦ Σουλτάν Μεχμέτ*, (on Mohammed II, conqueror of Constantinople,) that Mechmebey, a son of Amuratzuzi of Trebizond, made in the seraglio, for this monarch, a translation of the Bible from the Greek

into Arabic.<sup>1</sup> However interesting this book may be on other accounts, it can be of little use for our purposes.

An Arabic paraphrase of some *pericopæ* of Paul's Epistles, written by the side of the old Syriac text of these Epistles, has been discovered by an oriental scholar of great merit, in *Cod. Syr. Vat. Num. XXXIII*; and specimens of it have been published by him.<sup>2</sup>

## LATIN VERSIONS.

## § 113.

In the first period, before the time of Jerome the Presbyter, there were in Africa, Italy and Gaul several Latin versions differing very much from each other, as we may be convinced by a few specimens. Matt. 5: 16, "Luceat lumen vestrum coram hominibus, ut videant bona facta vestra, et clarificent patrem vestrum qui in cœlis est." (*Iren. Adv. Hær. L. IV. c. 37.*) "Luceat lumen vestrum coram hominibus, ut videant opera vestra bona, et magnificent patrem vestrum, qui in cœlis est." (*Hilar. Pict. Tract. in Ps. LXV.*) Matt. 6: 31. "Nolite cogitare dicentes: quid edemus, aut quid bibemus, aut quid vestiemur? hæc enim nationes quærunt." (*Cyprian. De Orat. Dom.*) "Nolite solliciti esse dicentes: quid manducabimus, et quid bibemus, aut quo operiemur?" (*Augustin. De Op. Manich. C. I.*) Matt. 11: 12. "A diebus enim Joannis Baptistæ regnum cœlorum cogitur, et cogentes diripiunt illud." (*Ambros. L. VI. in Lucam. c. 7. et De Cain et Abel. c. 4.*) "A diebus autem Joannis regnum cœlorum vim patitur, et vim facientes diripiunt illud." (*Hil. Pict. in Ps. VIII. n. 46. Optat. Milev. De Schism. Donatist. L. V. c. 5.*) "A diebus Jo. regnum cœlorum violentum est, et qui vim faciunt, diripiunt illud." (*Iren. L. IV. Adv. Hær. c. 37.*) Luke 9: 62. "Nemo tenens manicam aratri, post se attendens, intrabit in regnum cœlorum." (*Optat. Milevit. De Schism. Donatist. L. III. c. 11.*) "Nemo retro respiciens aratrum tenens aptus est regno cœlorum." (*Hilar. in Ps. CXXII. n. 4.*) Luke 21: 34. "Attendite—ne graventur corda vestra cruditate et vinolentiâ et curis secularibus." (*Augustin. Contra Adimant. Manich. C. 14.*) "Attendite—ne graventur corda vestra in crapulâ, et ebrietate et solitudinibus secularibus." (*Iren. L. IV. c. 37. n. 3.*)

Acts 2: 8. "Accipietes virtutem spiritu sancto in vos, et eritis mihi testes in Hierusalem in omni Judæâ, et in Samariâ, usque in fines terræ." (*Ambros. De Spir. Sanct. L. I. c. 7.*) "Accipietis virtutem spiritûs sancti supervenientem in vos, et eritis mihi testes apud Hierusalem et in totâ Judæâ et Samariâ et usque ad totam terram." (*Augustin. Contra Epist. fundam. c. 9.*) Acts 2: 2. "Et factus est subito de cœlo sonus, tanquam ferretur flatus vehemens, et implevit totum illum locum,

<sup>1</sup> Prof. Alter in the "Litterarischen Anzeiger" 9th number of the year 1799.

<sup>2</sup> Adler, Nov. Test. Vers. Syr. denuo examinatæ etc. Hafniæ 1789. 4to. p. 27—30. and 38.

ubi erant sedentes, et visæ sunt ipsis linguæ divisæ quasi ignis." (*Augustin. loc. cit.*) "Et factus est subito de cœlo sonus, tanquam vi magnâ spiritus ferretur; et replevit totam domum, ubi erant sedentes, et visæ sunt ipsis dispersæ linguæ tanquam ignis." (*Ambros. de Spirit. Sanct. L. I. c. 16.*)

Col. 5: 15. "Qui est imago Dei invisibilis, primogenitus omnis creaturæ; quia in ipso constituta sunt omnia in cœlis et in terra, visibilia et invisibilia, sive throni, sive principatus, sive potestates, sive dominationes, omnia per ipsum et in ipso condita sunt, etc." (*Hilar. L. VII. De Trinit. c. 49.*) "Quia ipse est imago Dei invisibilis, primogenitus omnis creaturæ, in quo creata sunt omnia in cœlestibus et in terra, sive visibilia sive invisibilia, sive sedes, sive dominationes, sive principatus et potestates, omnia per ipsum et in ipso creata sunt." (*Ambros. Comment. in Ps. CXVIII. Serm. III. c. 1.*) Col. 2: 8. "Videte, ne quis vos deprædetur per philosophiam et inanem fallaciam." (*Cyprian. Ep. LII.*) "Cavete, ne quis vos deprædetur per philosophiam et inanem seductionem secundum traditionem hominum, et secundum elementa hujus mundi." (*Ambros. De fide. L. I. c. 3. Comment. in Ps. CXVIII. Serm. 22. c. 1.*) "Videte ne quis vos spoliât per philosophiam et inanem deceptionem secundum trad. hom." (*Hilar. De Trin. L. I. c. 13. et XII. c. 20.*) Col. 2: 15. "Exutus carnem et potestates ostentui fecit, triumphatis iis cum fiduciâ in semetipso." (*Hilar. De Trin. L. I. c. 13. et IX. c. 10.*) "Exuens se carnem principatus et potestates exemplavit, fiducialiter triumphans eos in semetipso." (*Contra Faust. L. XVI. c. 29.*) 1 Peter 3: 3. "Ut sint non quæ a foris ornantur capillorum crispationibus, aut circumdatæ auro aut veste decorâ, sed ille absconditus cordis vetri homo" . . . . (*Augustin. De bono conjug. c. 12.*) "Non in plicatu capillorum, aut auro aut veste pretiosâ, quoniam ille absconditus cordis homo, qui est pauper sæculo, ipse est locuples Deo." (*Ambros. ad Virg. Exhort. Tom. I. p. 141, ed. Erasm.*)

Jerome speaks, likewise, of several interpreters, particularly of the New Testament.<sup>1</sup> A passage in Augustine, in which he speaks of the multitude of those who had translated the Bible from the Greek, seems to relate to the New no less than to the Old Testament.<sup>2</sup>

## § 114.

Which of these versions was first in the order of time, or at what time the translation of the New Testament into Latin was begun, are questions which at present can hardly be satisfactorily answered. Augustine tells us, "*primis fidei temporibus*";<sup>3</sup> but this expression may be understood as referring rather to the origin of the particular religious sect to which this father belonged, than to that of Christianity gener-

<sup>1</sup> Hieron. ad Damas. "Si autem veritas est quærenda de pluribus, cur non ad Græcam originem revertentes, ea quæ vel a vitiosis interpretibus male reddita . . . corrigimus? Neque vero ego de veteri disputo instrumento . . . de Novo nunc loquor Testamento, quod Græcum esse non dubium est."

<sup>2</sup> Augustin. de Doctr. Christ. L. II. c. 11.

<sup>3</sup> L. II. De Doctr. Christ. c. 11. "Ut enim cuique primis fidei temporibus in manus venit codex Græcus, et aliquantulum facultatis sibi utriusque linguæ habere videbatur, ausus est interpretari."

ally. We have not much information in regard to these early days of Christianity in the *Provincia Africæ*. Even in respect to the Bishops of Carthage we can go no further back than the close of the second century.

Some one of the African versions, certainly, must have been made in this period. For Tertullian expresses himself very plainly respecting the existence of one. He speaks of a *callida aut simplex eversio*, which in his opinion misrepresented a passage of the New Testament. Such *paronomasias* as *eversio* for *mala versio* are frequent with him; and the expression, *in usum exiit*, shows that in citing biblical passages the Latin language was the usual one among the common people.<sup>1</sup> He says something similar in another place, viz. in his book against Praxeas; more plainly still in his books against Marcion. Now, if in his days a Latin text had already gone *in usum*, it must have been prepared at the close of the 2d century.

### § 115.

Rome was not the place where the first Latin version originated. From the days of Hadrian onward under the Antonines, Greek literature prevailed so much in the metropolis of the world, and the use of this language was so general among all classes, that the necessity of a version was there least felt. In Italy, aside from Rome, one must have been more necessary; and therefore we should expect one to be made there, while in Rome it was hardly thought of. Accordingly Augustine speaks of a *versio Italica* and ascribes distinguished precedence to it;<sup>2</sup> yet, though the circumstance is very natural, pains have been taken, I know not why, to get rid of this word *Italica*.

Bentley was the first who proposed the conjecture that we should read *illa* instead of *Italica*, and instead of *nam est*—*quæ est* verborum tenacior. Casley is said afterwards to have observed a difference in MSS. in this passage; and Ernesti favored and strongly recommended this change, which thus obtained many friends and supporters among us.

The variation in some MSS. which David Casley asserts that he discovered, extends only to the word *Italica*; and yet it is of no less importance whether the reading *nam est* be correct. If this remains, the *illa* proposed can in no way be consistent with the connexion.

And suppose a single MS. reads *illa* for *Italica*, or even two; what

<sup>1</sup> De Monogam. c. 11. He is speaking of 1 Cor. 7: 39. "Sciamus plane non sic esse in Græco authentico, quomodo in usum exiit per duarum syllabarum aut callidam aut simplicem eversionem: *Si autem dormierit vir ejus*, quasi de futuro sonet," etc. and, Adv. Praxeam. c. 5. "Rationalis etiam Deus, et ratio in ipso prius; et ita ab ipso omnia. Quæ ratio sensus ipsius est. Hanc Græci λόγον dicunt, quo vocabulo etiam sermonem appellamus. Ideoque jam in usu est nostrorum, per simplicitatem interpretationis, sermonem dicere in primordio apud Deum fuisse." L. II. Adv. Marcion. c. 9. "In primis tenendum, quod Græca Scriptura (Gen. II. 7. ἀναπνοήν ζωής) signavit, adflatum nominans, non spiritum. Quidam enim de Græco interpretantes, non recogitatâ differentiâ, nec curatâ proprietate verborum, pro adflatu spiritum ponunt." L. V. Adv. Marc. c. 4. "Quæ sunt allegorica, (Galat. IV. 24) id est aliud portententia: hæc sunt duo testamenta, sive duæ ostensiones, sicut invenimus interpretatum."

<sup>2</sup> L. II. De Doctr. Christ. c. 16. "In ipsis autem inter pretationibus Italica ceteris præferatur; nam est verborum tenacior cum perepicuitate sententiæ."



follows? On what principle of criticism must we proceed? Must we not inquire which reading might most easily have arisen from the other? If so, must it not be admitted that *illa* might very naturally arise from abbreviating the word *Itala*? We cannot so easily explain how a copyist could make *Itala* out of the word *illa*. Were it as easy, how happens it that *Itala* has nowhere else been made of the word *illa*, which occurs in MSS. thousands of times? Of two readings, one of which exhibits a common occurrence and the other one somewhat rare, which, according to the laws of criticism, ought we to prefer?

Among the arguments in behalf of the reading *illa*, much is made of the context as favoring and requiring it. What then does Augustine say in the preceding chapter? When obscure and unintelligible expressions occur, says he, it may contribute to their elucidation to consult and compare several different versions; but amended copies only must be used, that we may not be imposed upon by inaccuracies. And then he proceeds in the following chapter: "In ipsis autem interpretationibus—ceteris præferatur—est verborum tenacior cum perspicuitate sententiæ. Et Latinis quibuslibet emendandis Græci adhibeantur," etc. There cannot be a doubt on the face of these words, that he intends to name that particular one among the Latin versions which contained the fewest unintelligible expressions; and which, in case of the occurrence of such in others, would most aid in explaining them. Now suppose we read: *illa, quæ est*—what would the father say, but that, in order to clear up obscure expressions, that version which was least obscure should be employed? A very sorry comfort, indeed, and one which the unlearned portion of his readers could hardly apply to their own case. It would be expected, therefore, that he should designate a particular version, which in his opinion, or that of good judges, would afford aid in time of need. Now if the scope of the writer as well as the connexion demand something of this kind, we cannot hesitate to give the preference to a reading which fulfils the demand, and designates by name the version which excels the rest in point of perspicuity.

This, too, is the signification of this father's language in another work. In case of discrepancy between the Latin versions, he says, *we must consult those which originated in the country whence the doctrine came to us*; and if this does not avail, we must recur to the original language from which these versions were made.<sup>1</sup> He here concedes to a foreign version the superiority over the African; i. e. to the version of that country from which the *Provincia Africæ* received christianity. And whence then did these *Italian colonies* along the African coast receive their religious faith, but from the mother-country?

It was, therefore, an Italian version to which Augustine applied this

---

1 Augustin. L. XI. c. 2. Contra Faust. Manich. "Ita si de fide exemplarium quæstio verteretur, sicut in nonnullis, quæ paucæ sunt, et sacrarum litterarum notissimæ sententiarum varietates, vel ex aliarum regionum codicibus, unde ipsa doctrina commavit, nostra dubitatio adjudicaretur: vel si hi ipsi quoque codices variarent, plures paucioribus, vetustiores recentioribus præferrentur: et si adhuc esset incerta varietas, præcedens lingua, unde illud interpretatum est, consuleretur."

encomium; but which he intended among the many in existence,<sup>1</sup> we can hardly now determine. That Italy gradually acquired a great number of them, we see from the citations in the writings of the Latin fathers. This Italian version intended by him he seems even to have regarded as more ancient than those which had originated in Africa.

### § 116.

The period at which these versions arose (the latter half of the second or the commencement of the third century,) enables us readily to determine what must have been the character of the Greek copies from which they were executed. It was the period in which the inconsiderate pains of pious readers brought the MSS. into that heterogeneous and arbitrary condition, which was afterwards arrested by Origen, Hesychius, and Lucian. It was the period of the *κοινή ἐκδοσις*. We have already discussed so fully the text which was the basis of these versions, that we shall here merely refer to our former observations, in § 27, 28.

### § 117.

These versions, as was intended, passed into the hands of a multitude of readers. Each of them had its good and bad qualities, and it was therefore attempted to remedy from one the imperfections of another; so that in this way all of them became encumbered with foreign additions. Such a mode of procedure could not continue long without causing a gradual admixture of one version with another, until neither was any longer like itself. Such was really the case; for as early as the fourth century every MS. appeared to be a separate version.<sup>2</sup>

There were even respectable persons who ascribed special value to a copy, if it was interpolated from several versions; for they thought that from many exhibitions of the same passage the reader might more easily understand and correctly interpret it.<sup>3</sup> And this would have been right, had there been no inconveniences to outweigh this advantage.

Besides all this, readers added to the MSS. explanatory notes and *scholia* for their own information, which were not afterwards invariably separated from the text, as they should have been, and thus increased the confusion.

Those who knew something of Greek endeavored to avail themselves of their knowledge by writing the Greek Testament at the side of one

<sup>1</sup> They have been collected by Peter Sabatier: "Bibliorum Sacrorum Latinæ versiones antiquæ," etc. III. Vols. Remis. 1743. fol.; and by Jos. Blanchini: "Evangelium quadruplex Latinæ versionis antiquæ, seu veteris Italicæ," etc. Romæ. 1749. Part. II. usually in four volumes folio.

<sup>2</sup> Hieronym. Epist. ad Damas. "Si enim Latinis exemplaribus fides adhibenda est, respondeant quibus: tot enim sunt exemplaria, quot codices."

<sup>3</sup> To explain obscure expressions, says Augustine, (De Doctr. Christ. L. II. c. 15,) "Plurimum hic quoque juvat interpretum numerositas collatis codicibus inspecta atque discussa: tantum absit falsitas: nam codicibus emendandis primitus debet invigilare solertia eorum, qui Scripturas divinas nosse desiderant, ut emendatis non emendati cedant, ex uno duntaxat interpretationis genere venientes." Here *non emendati* and *ex uno interpretationis genere venientes* are synonymous. *Emendati*, therefore, are those which have many additions from several versions.

of the Latin versions, that they might be able to consult the original directly, when doubt arose or the version appeared to be imperfect. From such MSS. were derived the Græco-Latin MSS., of which we still possess several. The possessors of such MSS., as may be seen from those still extant, often undertook to correct the versions from the Greek, in an arbitrary manner, according to their own judgment; and the more they corrected, the more unlike what it was originally did the version become.

Thus each version no longer resembled itself, and if the copies were to be subjected much longer to the caprice of their possessors, without any public superintendence, there might well have been apprehensions in regard to the doctrines which would be deduced from such remarkable MSS.

## JEROME'S EMENDATION.

## § 118.

It was a bold step to oppose this mischief and attempt to evoke order and harmony. Jerome felt it to be so, though he was urged to it by the most distinguished ecclesiastic in Christendom, viz. Damasus, who then occupied the chair of Rome, "*Quis enim,*" (he writes to Damasus) "*doctus pariter vel indoctus, cum in manum volumen assumserit, et a salivâ, quam semel imbibit, viderit discrepare quod lectitat, non statim erumpat in vocem, me falsarium, me clamans esse sacrilegum . . . adversum quam invidiam . . . me consolatur, quod et tu, qui summus sacerdos es, fieri jubes,*" etc.<sup>1</sup>

With these expectations Jerome entered upon his task, and prosecuted it with a moderation beyond what could have been expected, considering his usual rashness. He compared one or more of the existing versions with Greek MSS., and altered them according to the original text when it was necessary. But, in order that the discrepancy between his emendation and the ancient versions might not be too striking, he was careful, in the selection of his MSS., to get only such ancient copies as contained a text analogous to that from which these versions had been made. He therefore employed only copies of the period of the *κοινὴ ἔκδοσις*, and scrupulously avoided the editions of Lucian and Hesychius,<sup>2</sup> which deviated too far from the text to which the ears of the Latins were accustomed.

Besides being so cautious in the selection of his MSS., he also made

<sup>1</sup> "Epistola ad Damasum," or as this Epistle is denominated in several books, "Hieronymi in Evangelistas ad Damasum præfatio."

<sup>2</sup> Epist. ad Damas. "Prætermitto eos codices, quos a Luciano et Hesychio nuncupatos paucorum hominum asserit perversa contentio, quibus utique nec in toto veteri instrumento post LXX interpretes emendare quid licuit, nec in novo profuit emendâsse. Igitur hæc præsens præfatiuncula pollicetur quatuor Evangelia . . . codicum Græcorum emendata collatione, sed veterum, nec qui multum a lectionis Latine consuetudine discreparent."

so sparing a use of them as to resort to their assistance only when the sense was widely mistaken and greater accuracy was necessary.<sup>1</sup>

If we may infer from his Commentaries the principles of procedure which he silently followed in his emendation, he sometimes consulted Origenian MSS. in doubtful passages.<sup>2</sup> This reasonable supposition led Bentley to the singular notion of finding Origen's Recension without variation in Jerome's amended edition.

The last three years of the life of Damasus Jerome spent with him and in full possession of his confidence, at Rome; and after his decease he forever abandoned the noisy and dissolute city for a simple hut in Bethlehem. We are thus enabled to determine the period of Jerome's emendation, viz. the last year but one of the life of Damasus.

Jerome presented him first the Gospels alone: "*Igitur hæc præsens præfatiuncula pollicetur quatuor tantum Evangelia.*" This circumstance has led some to apprehend that his emendation did not comprehend the whole New Testament. The language shows this to be a mistake; he presented *only* the Gospels with *the present dedication*—plainly pointing to something more yet to come. Subsequently, in a catalogue of Christian writers at the end of which he names his own works, he mentions among them the New Testament amended by him from Greek copies, and the Old which he translated from Hebrew.<sup>3</sup> He says the same in a letter to Lucinius: the New Testament I have faithfully rendered according to the Greek original; for, as the Hebrew MSS. are the standard of the Old, so are the Greek of the New.<sup>4</sup>

In an Epistle to Marcella, who had communicated to him in a friendly way all the calumnies of his enemies in respect to his emendation of the Gospels, he presents some passages of the Pauline Epistles according to his amendment. Rom. 12: 1 was generally read: "*spe gaudentes, tempori servientes;*" but by him: "*spe gaudentes, Deo servi- entes.*" The old MSS. omitted, in 1 Tim. 5: 19, the words: "*nisi sub duobus aut tribus testibus;*" he restored them. The former read in 1 Tim. 1: 15, "*humanus sermo et omni acceptione dignus;*" he amended the passage thus: "*fidelis sermo et omni acceptione dignus.*"<sup>5</sup>

The text of his emendation is found only in those works which he composed after the death of Damasus. In the Commentaries on Matthew, (certainly the most hasty of his productions,) we might reasonably expect that he would not use an inferior version as the basis of his expositions, but the one which he had amended. Nor could he in a commentary trust to his memory, as in other cases he did, and was obliged to do, from the multitude of his quotations. It was his duty to have the MS. itself before his eyes.

<sup>1</sup> Epist. ad Damas. "Ita calamo temperavimus, ut his tantum, quæ sensum videbantur mutare, correctis, relinqua manere pateremur."

<sup>2</sup> Comment. in Matt. 24: 36. "In quibusdam codicibus additum est neque filius; cum in quibusdam Græcis, et maxime Adamantii et Pierii exemplaribus, hoc non habeatur adscriptum." Comment. ad Galatas III. 1. "quod in exemplarius Adamantii non habetur," etc.

<sup>3</sup> "Novum Test. Græcæ fidei reddidi; vetus juxta Hebraicam transtuli."

<sup>4</sup> Ep. ad Lucin. LXXI. (formerly 28) § 5. "Novum Testamentum Græcæ reddidi auctoritati. Ut enim veterum librorum fides de Hebraicis voluminibus examinanda est; ita novorum Græci sermonis normam desiderat."

<sup>5</sup> Ad Marcellam, XXVII; formerly Ep. 102.



Accordingly, his Commentaries are upon this version. He observes where it renders the Greek imperfectly, (e. g. Matt. 5: 25, *ἐννοῶν* 6: 11, *ἐπιούσιον* 16, *ἀφανίζειν* 9: 32, *κωτός* 11: 16, *ἀγορά* 15: 30, *κυλ-  
λούς* 16: 22, *ἰλεώς σοι*.) mentions the variations of other MSS., (6: 25.  
11: 19. 16: 2, etc.) and blames or justifies them.

Its relation to the present Vulgate, the Clementine edition of 1592, is this: the latter agrees in general with the former, differing from it only in transpositions of words, or such slight changes as have been made by time or the critical judgment of him who executed the Clementine edition. We will spare ourselves the trouble of proving by a collation of Matthew what will strike every one immediately on his own inspection; especially as, in speaking of Alcuin's emendation, we shall present a collation of some chapters of the Epistle to the Galatians as its text is exhibited in the commentaries of this father.

### § 119.

Though Jerome exercised great caution, he gained, nevertheless, as he anticipated, more enemies than friends. His work was hardly in circulation, when the voice of zealots was loudly raised against him; and he occasionally chastised them with considerable severity.<sup>1</sup> Even the authority of Damasus availed so little to cause a general reception of his emendation that every one for himself adopted or rejected the old or new text, as judgment or prejudice directed him.

In the 5th century the supreme pontiff at Rome, Leo the Great, still used the ancient version, and not the purest even of the copies of that, as may be inferred from the large addition he makes to Matthew 20: 28. ("Vos autem quæritis de minimo crescere et de magno minui, rel.") which he quotes in his Epistle to Pulcheria.

The authority of Gregory the Great, in the 6th century, first decided in favor of the edition of Jerome. Gregory made it the basis of his moral Annotations on Job, and only used the old version for the purpose of comparison, and rather to discover its defects than to employ it in explanation. In his epistle to Leander, bishop of Seville, to whom he dedicated this work, he says, indeed, that he used sometimes the old and sometimes the new version, as the one or the other was best adapted to his purpose, since both were recognised by the apostolical chair which he occupied;<sup>2</sup> but his actual procedure in this work evinces his predilection for Jerome. In his other writings he confines himself wholly to Jerome's edition, so that his citations would be of uncommon value in restoring this emendation. Leander, probably, did much to promote

<sup>1</sup> Hieronym. Ep. XXVII (formerly 102) ad Marcellam.—"Ad me repente perlatum est quosdam homunculos mihi studiose detrahere, cur adversum auctoritatem veterum, et totius mundi opinionem, aliquid in Evangeliiis emendare tentaverim. Quos ego cum possim meo jure contemnere (asino quippe lyra superflue canit) . . . ita responsum habeant . . . Latinorum codicum vitiositatem . . . ad Græcam originem . . . voluisse revocare" etc.

<sup>2</sup> Greg. Ep. ad Leandr. C. 5. "Novam vero translationem dissero: sed cum probationis causa exigit, nunc novam, nunc veterem per testimonia assumo: ut quia sedes apostolica, cui deo auctore praesideo utrâque utitur, mei quoque labor studii ex utrâque fulciatur."

its adoption, for in the 9th century it was the dominant and authorised version in Spain.<sup>1</sup>

### § 120.

As Jerome's emendation adhered so closely to the other versions, it might frequently happen that the former would be elucidated from the latter, and even enriched with additions which he had rejected. On the other hand, however, there were readers who corrected the ancient versions by consulting Jerome's edition, and thus formed a third text, which was a mixture of the two. The *Codex Argent.* of the Gospels at Brescia is such a MS., as is thought by those who have themselves examined the Codex.<sup>2</sup> Their opinion is established by the following considerations. The MS. exhibits in general one of the ancient versions, but does not contain many additions and peculiarities which are found in them. It coincides more frequently than these with Jerome's phraseology. Blanchini<sup>3</sup> mentions another Codex of the Gospels (*Vatic.* 7016,) of about the 8th century, (as is shown by the specimen,) the text of which is compounded partly from one of the old versions and partly from Jerome's edition. This may have been the case more or less in many other MSS.; so that in the 8th century the complaints respecting the corruption of the MSS. occasioned a new revision of them.

### THE EMENDATION OF ALCUIN.

### § 121.

The merit of originating this emendation is to be attributed to a celebrated monarch, whose exalted mind first perceived the occasion for it and actively promoted it throughout; and who, though he needed some one else to execute the task, sketched out to him the path he must pursue. The condition of the biblical MSS. did not escape the attention of Charles the Great. He therefore ordered that care should be taken to have good and pure copies of the Old and New Testament in the churches.<sup>4</sup>

He afterwards caused a selection of the homilies of the fathers for all the Sundays and festivals to be compiled by Alcuin, that the clergy of his kingdom might be provided with a collection of sermons. The preface to this he composed himself, and in it he speaks of the *emendation of the biblical copies*, as a thing which he had happily accomplished.<sup>5</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Isidor. Hispal. *De offic. eccles.* L. I. c. 12.

<sup>2</sup> Philipp. Garbellus apud Blanchinium. *Vindic. Canoniar. Scripturar. Vulgatæ Latinæ editionis.* Romæ. 1740. fol. p. CCCLXXXVII. seq.

<sup>3</sup> *Evangeliar. quadrupl.* T. II. p. DCIV. on the reverse no. 34.

<sup>4</sup> "Capitular. R. R. Franc. L. VI. C. 227. "Volumus, et ita missis nostris mandare praecepimus, ut in ecclesiis libri canonici veraces habeantur, sicut jam in alio capitulari saepius mandavimus."

<sup>5</sup> This Homiliarium, afterwards improved by Paul Warnefried, has been often printed under Alcuin's name: Spirae 1482. Colon. 1530. 1539. 1557. fol. "Igitur,"

It might be inferred from his language that he himself assisted in this emendation, nor is it improbable that he did. But the learned monk Alcuin had the special charge of it, as history, as well as he himself in one of his works, expressly declares.<sup>1</sup>

The statement of a biographer of his son, that Charles himself amended the four Gospels, has no reference to Alcuin's edition, which had been in circulation for a long time. He is speaking of the pious employments with which the monarch occupied the last days of his life, viz. alms-giving, reading and emendation.<sup>2</sup>

### § 122.

A new version from the Greek was not intended on this occasion. Charles did not require, nor did Alcuin promise this. Both speak only of an emendation of an existing version. We perceive at once in Alcuin's MSS. the particular version which was the subject of his labors. He has prefixed to the Gospels Jerome's Epistle to Damasus: "Novum opus me facere cogis ex veteri;" and to all the books Jerome's prefaces.

Blanchini has presented copper-plate specimens of MSS. of this class, comprising the beginning of Luke as far as v. 16, the 2d chapter from v. 22 to the end, and the whole of the third;<sup>3</sup> which are sufficient to give us an idea of the character of this emendation.

### § 123.

I was recently permitted to examine a MS. of Alcuin's edition, which contains the Old and New Testament entire, and claims a distinguished rank among the MSS. of king Charles' emendation. Mr. Von Speyer, *Passavant* of Basle, a friend and connoisseur of the monuments of ancient art and science, is its fortunate possessor. I found it so remarkable for its diplomatic peculiarities, that, as I had leisure for the purpose, I transcribed it. I cannot treat of it here more particularly than is necessary to explain what Alcuin attempted and effected.

A long poem by the copyist ends with the following verses, and certifies us that we have the edition of Alcuin:

---

says Charles in the Preface, "quia curæ nobis est, ut ecclesiarumstrarum ad meliora semper proficiat status . . . . ad pernoscenda sacrorum librorum studia nostro etiam, quo possumus, invitamus exemplo. Inter quæ jam pridem universos V. et N. Testamenti libros librariorum imperitiâ depravatos, Deo in omnibus nos adjuvante, examussim correximus."

<sup>1</sup> Sigebert. Gemblac. ad Ann. 790. In the dedication of the 6th book of his Commentaries on John, "ad Gislam et Columbam:" Alcuin says, "Totius forsan Evangelii expositionem direxissem vobis, nisi me occupasset Domini Regis præceptum in emendatione Veteris Novique Testamenti."

<sup>2</sup> Theganus. ed. du Chesne, T. II. Script. Francic. p. 277.

<sup>3</sup> Evangeliar. Quadrupl. P. II. Tab. VIII. Luke 1: 1-16, is from *Cod. Vallicellano* B. No. 5; the 2d and 3d chapters are from *Cod. Basilicæ S. Pauli extra urbem*, adorned with the portrait of Charles the Great. The hand writing of both is so nearly the same as to appear to be by the same person.

Codicis istius quod sint in corpore sancto  
 Depictæ formis litterulæ variis  
 Mercedē habeat Christo donante per ævum  
 Is Carolus qui jam scribe jussit eum (scribere)  
 Haec dator æternus cunctorum Christe bonorum  
 Munera de donis accipe sancta tuis.  
 Quæ pater Albinus devoto pectore supplex  
 Nominis ad laudem obtulit ecce tui.  
 Quem tua perpetuis conservet dextra diebus  
 Ut felix tecum vivat in arce poli.  
 Pro me quisque legas versus orare memento  
 Alchuine dicor ego tu sine fine vale.

A comparison of Alcuin's edition of the Old Testament with the text of Jerome as exhibited in his Commentaries on the prophets, and of the New Testament with Jerome's text as contained in his Commentaries on Matthew and the Epistle to the Galatians, convinces us that Alcuin intended nothing more than to restore Jerome's Bible as accurately as possible.

We will prove this by examples. For this purpose we shall present the 12th, 13th, and 14th Chapters of Matthew, first according to the Vulgate, (Clement's edition,) then according to the text of Jerome. Where Alcuin agrees with Jerome, we shall denote it by an asterisk. Where the asterisk is wanting, he accords with the Vulgate. The readings in which he differs from both will be noticed separately.

	VULGATE.	JEROME.
XII.	1. per sata sabato	sabbato per sata. *
	2. Licet facere	licet eis facere
	4. ei edere	ei comedere
	25. divisum contra se	in se divisum
	31. blasphemia	blasphemiæ *
	44. eam vacantem	vacantem.
XIII.	14. et adimpletur	ut adimpleatur *
	23. fructum affert et facit	fructum facit
	24. simile factum est.	simile est
	35. dictum erat	dictum est. *
	37. ait illis	ait *
	41. mittet	mittet ergo
	54. in synagogis	in sinagoga
XIV.	3. uxorem fratris	uxorem Philippi fratris
	9. propter juramentum	propter jusjurandum. *
	25. super mare	supra mare
	26. super mare	supra mare
	28. ad te venire	venire ad te *

Readings which differ from both Jerome and the Vulgate are :



	VULG. JER.	ALCUIN.
XII.	14. perderent eum 27. vestri erunt 29. diripiet	eum perderent erunt vestri diripiat
XIII.	4. volucres coeli 8. autem ceciderunt 14. dicentis 15. videant oculis 22. seminatus est 23. centesimum,—sexagesi- mum—trigesimum 43. audiendi audiat	volucres verò ceciderunt dicens oculis videant est seminatus centum—sexaginta —triginta audiat
XIV.	5. volens illum 18. mihi illos huc 22. compulit Jesus	volens eum huc mihi illos jussit.

## Epistle to the Galatians.

	VULGATE.	JEROME.
I.	4. sæculo nequam 5. sic tam cito 10. an quæro 15. ex utero 16. evangelizarem 23. aliquando expugnabat	sæculo malo tam cito aut quæro * de utero * evangelizem quondam expugnabat
II.	1. iterum ascendi seorsum autem iis 2. qui videbantur aliquid esse 3. esset gentilis 4. sed propter subintroductos subjectione 6. ab iis videbantur esse aliquid 7. sicut et Petro 9. Jacobus, Cephas et Joannes	rursum ascendi seorsum autem his * qui videbantur esset ex gentibus propter subintroductos autem * subjectioni ab his * videbantur sicut Petro * Petrus, Jacobus et Joannes
	11. venisset Cephas 13. illam simulationem 14. recte ambularent Cephæ 18. iterum hæc ædifico 20. vivit autem 21. gratis Christus	venisset Petrus illa simulatione recto pede incedant Petro hæc iterum reædifico * vivit vero Christus gratis
III.	1. præscriptus 3. consummemini 6. sicut scriptum est Abraham 7. ii sunt 16. promissiones 18. num si ex lege 19. cui promiserat 24. justificemur 25. sumus sub pædagogo 29. semen Abrahæ	proscriptus consummamini * sicut Abraham * hi sunt * repromissiones quia si ex lege cui promissum erat justificemur sub pædagogo sumus Abrahæ semen. *

## Alcuin's peculiar readings.

II. 20. semetipsum	se ipsum
III. 1. non obedire	non credere
2. a vobis volo	volo a vobis.
16. qui est Christus	quod est Christus
26. per fidem qua est	per fidem.

From this comparison we deduce the conclusion that Jerome, Alcuin and the Vulgate exhibit in the main the same text, differing only in slight transpositions, such as *sabbato per sata: sata per sabbato*,—*semen Abrahæ: Abrahæ semen*; or in such variations as *verò* for *autem*; and rarely in more important readings, such as *centesimum—sexagesimum—trigesimum: centum—sexaginta—triginta*, *non obedire: non credere*, and the like.

The most remarkable variation of the MS. of Alcuin's text from the Vulgate relates to 1 John 5: 7. "Tres sunt qui testimonium dant in cœlo: pater, verbum et spiritus, et hi tres unum sunt." This passage does not appear in Von Speyer's MS., nor in the Alcuinian MS. at Zurich.<sup>1</sup> Mabillon, in his *Iter Italicum*, the use of which I have not been able to procure, testifies the same in regard to other Latin MSS. of this class.

## § 124.

Other MSS., likewise, of Alcuin's edition attest their origin by a larger or smaller number of verses. Some, e. g. the Amsterdam MS., declare it as follows:<sup>2</sup>

Quatuor hi rutilant uno de fonte fluentes,  
Matthæi et Marci, Lucæ liber atque Johannis:  
Sanctus Apostolus Lucas conscripserat Actus:  
Bis septem docti per cartas dogmata Pauli,  
Jacobi, Petri, Judæ et pia dicta Johannis,  
Scribitur extremo Johannis in ordine tomus.  
Jusserat hos omnes Christi deductus amore  
Alcuinus Ecclesiæ famulus conscribere libros.

Others contain only the last two verses of this postscript.<sup>3</sup> Others still, as the Codex *Vallicellens.* in Blanchini, that of the Fathers of the Oratory at Rome, and one mentioned by Baronius at the date 778, which is now in the *Chiesa nuova*,<sup>4</sup> have the following lines:

Codicis istius quot sunt in corpore sancto  
Depictæ formis litterulæ variis:  
Mercedes habeat Christo donante per ævum  
Tot Carolus Rex, qui scribere jussit eum.

<sup>1</sup> Martini Gerberti *Iter Alemanicum*, Typis San-Blasianis. 1765. p. 47, 48.

<sup>2</sup> Wetstein *Prolegom.* in N. T.

<sup>3</sup> The Zurich Codex in Biörnsthål, Vol. 5. of his letters, p. 14.

<sup>4</sup> Blanchini *Vindiciæ Canon. Scriptur.* p. XXXVI. and p. CCCXXXV. Adler's "*Biblisch-kritische Reise*," p. 162.

Pro me quisque legens versus orare memento,  
Alcuinus dicor : tu sine fine vale.

Some are more diffuse in this species of epigrammatic verse ; others contain only the last two lines.

§ 125.

This edition was introduced by the royal injunction into the kingdom of France, and it was probably the source of all the MSS. which were subsequently current on the other side of the Rhine, on the German bank, and further on to Pannonia. It was this text which, with some variations, as might be expected, was current among us for about eight centuries, until the council of Trent, which by its decrees caused a new epoch in respect to the Latin versions.

Yet during this period, active exertions were made to preserve the Latin text in good condition. Lanfranc, Archbishop of Canterbury, in the 11th century, amended not only the Scriptures of the Old and New Testament, but likewise the works of the fathers and other ecclesiastical books. Not content with this, he employed his pupils in the same way. His biographer concludes this account with the words : "*Hujus emendationis claritate omnis occidui orbis ecclesia, tam Gallicana quam Anglica, gaudet se esse illuminatam.*"<sup>1</sup> This encomium, however, has reference, not merely to his biblical labors, but to his critical labors generally upon the writings of the fathers, and upon Hymn-books and Liturgies. This is necessary to be observed, lest it should be inferred from the words : "*Hujus emendationis claritate*" etc. that he prepared a new Recension of the Old and New Testament, which became the dominant one in France and England.

In the 12th and 13th centuries, a remarkable zeal for the preservation of the Latin text of the Bible began to be exhibited. Several bodies composed *Correctoria* for their own use ; i. e. they revised some particular MS., noting upon its margin where other MSS. did not agree with it, and appending short notes in which they criticised the readings admitted or rejected by them. In deciding, they made use of the writings of the fathers, and celebrated ecclesiastics after the time of Charles the Great, such as Rhabanus, Haymo of Halberstadt, and others, and frequently also the Greek text. Nor was this all. Care was taken to prevent inconsiderate corrections. Where the Latin was not exactly grammatical, pains were taken to notice such peculiarities of phraseology, that no one might undertake to alter them. Some observations were made, too, in respect to punctuation, and even pronunciation.

Such a *Correctorium* was projected by the Theological Faculty of the University of Paris, probably for the use of the students ; and it was also adopted or authorized by the Archbishop and Primate of France, who had his seat at Sens. It is described by Richard Simon.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Vita Lanfranci in Opp. Paris. 1648. fol. edit. Lucæ Dacherii. Wetstein's Proleg. in N. T.

<sup>2</sup> "Hist. crit. des versions du N. T." Ch. 9. and "Nouvelles Observations sur le Texte et les Versions du N. T." P. II. Ch. 1.

The Dominicans esteemed the authority of the Archbishop but slightly, and in 1236 composed one for themselves, by order of their Provincial in France, Hugo de St. Cher or Cherfs.<sup>1</sup> Under Humbert de Romans, the 5th General of their Order, the *Correctorium* of Sens was expressly rejected in a General Chapter at Paris in 1256.<sup>2</sup> They were guided in their *Correctorium* by Charles' MSS., as we are informed by Luke of Bruges, on the authority of the preface of one which he frequently used.<sup>3</sup>

The Carthusian order, too, in its *Correctorium*, adopted the Alcuinian or Carolinian edition as a standard.<sup>4</sup>

Our University-Library contains one of these *correctoria*. It is that of the Franciscan order, as is clear from the first letter of the preface to the Old Testament. On its golden ground is painted the Pope, in the act of delivering a paper to some members of this order; two are receiving it kneeling, while four others are looking on in the background.

I will select a single specimen of each species of note which it contains. The first relates to a various reading of Matt. 19:20: *omnia hæc custodivi*. In the margin is found: *ajuventute meâ—Græci habent. Sed Jeronymus Rhabanus et antiqui non*. Another respects the punctuation of Matt. 14: 9: *Et contristatus est rex propter iusjurandum*. In the margin: *sic distinguit Augustinus in omeliâ*. A third relates to grammar. Matt. 21: 25: *Baptismum Johannis unde erat*: in the margin: *Antiqua grammatica est. Hæc utitur Ambrosius in Sermon. oct. in Ephes. et decimo octavo, etc.* An observation on the transposition found in some MSS. in 1 John 5: 7, is of special interest: *Not. Quidam libri habent hic alium ordinem. Post testimonium spiritûs, aquæ et sanguinis, addunt: et hi tres unum sunt, et pergunt sic: et tres sunt, qui testimonium dant in cælo, etc.*

This *correctorium*, in criticising the text, sometimes cites those fathers whose quotations exhibit the text as it was in the time of Jerome, such as Augustine and Ambrose. If this was done in others likewise, the *correctoria* themselves contributed to deform the text of Jerome and Alcuin by the introduction of foreign materials.

William Lindan speaks of a much earlier *correctorium*, on the authority of MS. accounts in the possession of Cardinal Bessarion, which he probably obtained from the Vatican Library, and which refer to the year 1144: *Sed præ cæteris equidem desiderarim illud, quod ante annos 400*

<sup>1</sup> Martene, Thesaur. nov. Anecd. T. IV. p. 1676. Statut. 34. Capit. gener. Dominic.

<sup>2</sup> Martene loc. cit. p. 1715. Statut. 23. Capit. gener. Item correctiones bibliæ Senonensis non adprobamus, nec volumus, quod fratres innitantur illi correctioni etc.

<sup>3</sup> Lucæ Burgens. Notationes in Sac. Biblia. 1584. apud Plantin. 4. Præf. p. 22. "Exemplar . . . . emendatum ante trecentos annos ex Caroli magni Bibliis undequaque collectis, jussu, ut præfatio habet, F. Jordani magistri ordinis Prædicatorum et F. Hugonis prioris provincialis in Francia a Prædicatoribus S. Domini ci fratribus."

<sup>4</sup> Wilh. Lindanus, De optimo Scripturas interpret. genere. L. III. C. 3. "Tale quondam vidimus (correctorium) pervetustum in Carthusiâ Zeelhemensi, juxta Diesthemium sitâ, quod Biblia ad codices Caroli magni perdiligenter castigatos notabat emendanda."



*Romæ Nicolaus S. Damasi Diaconus scripsit maximâ, ut apparet, diligentia, ubi conqueritur, Lustrans armaria, inquiens, nequibam hoc adipisci, veracia scilicet exemplaria invenire, quia et quam a doctissimis viris dicebantur correcta, unoquoque in suo sensu abundante, adeo discrepabant, ut pene quot codices, tot exemplaria reperirem, usque adeo etiam millesimo fere post interpretationem Hieronymi anno, codices mendosi atque corrupti erant, etc.* (De optimo Scripturas interpret. genere L. III. c. 3. Comp. L. I. c. 5.)

It must be borne in mind that Nicholas is speaking of Rome and its vicinity, where Charles' emendation may not have been acknowledged. In France, where it was predominant, the text, many as were the alterations it experienced, was more uniform and harmonious in its different MSS.

### § 126.

As the MSS. differed from each other so exceedingly, the printed editions of the 15th and 16th centuries could not well be better in this respect than the MSS. from which they were derived. This discrepancy excited special attention in the 16th century, and more than ever when the council of Trent was convened. The editions of Robert Stephens, and that of Colinæus in 1541, the preface to which contains bitter complaints in regard to the errors of the Vulgate, directed the attention of many to the subject. The principal occasion of this was the recent publication of the Hebrew and Greek text, and the awakening study of biblical criticism, which necessarily exposed the received church-version to unfavorable comparisons.

The council of Trent perceived that the sources whence arguments might be drawn must be agreed upon, before any idea of unity in doctrine could be indulged. It was even seriously proposed to make use for this purpose of a particular Hebrew and Greek MS., and to translate it into Latin for the benefit of such as were unskilled in the languages.<sup>1</sup> But this would have been to present to the multitude a new source of controversies, while there was good reason rather to attempt to arrest further innovations, and at least to unite those who were still adherents to the ancient doctrinal belief. In this view it was most prudent to confirm the authority of the received church-version, as was done by the Synod. (Sess. IV. Decret. 2.) "*Statuit et declarat hæc sancta Synodus, ut hæc vetus et vulgata editio, quæ longo tot sæculorum usu in Ecclesiâ ipsâ probata est, in publicis lectionibus, disputationibus, prædicationibus, aut expositionibus, pro authentica habeatur: ut eam nemo rejicere quovis prætextu audeat vel præsumat.*"

Great pains have been taken to explain this decree in such a way as not to depreciate the study of the original languages. The meaning is plainly this. As in civil affairs an authentic instrument is valid evidence, so in public religious matters the Vulgate is a document from which valid argument may be drawn, without prejudice, however, to other documents. But this is not a prescription of doctrine, and from its nature could not be; it is a decree on a point of discipline, having reference to the circumstances of the times in which it was issued.

<sup>1</sup> Palavicini Hist. Conc. Trident. L. VI. c. 15.

Among the many editions, no two of which agreed with each other, it was necessary now to fix upon one to which the preeminence should belong, or, in default of any such edition, to agree in respect to the preparation of one. For the present the Synod merely ordained: "*ut post-hâc Sacra Scriptura, potissimum verò hæc ipsa vetus et vulgata editio, quam emendatissime imprimatur.*"

## § 127.

The theologians of Lyons, and among them Hentenius in particular, now set about preparing a corrected edition, which appeared as early as the next year, 1547. But the Holy See at Rome had, it would seem, reserved this business for itself; and Pius IV and V nominated persons to whom it was entrusted. Sixtus V, whose ardent disposition could not endure the slow progress in executing the work, brought it to a close,<sup>1</sup> and announced it as finished in a bull of March 1, 1589.

He caused a printing press to be set up in the Vatican expressly for the edition, and *he himself corrected it*, after it was printed, as he says in his Papal bull: "Novam interea typographiam in Apostolico Vaticano palatio nostro ad id potissimum magnifice extruximus . . . . eaque res quo magis incorrupte perficeretur, *nostrâ nos ipsi manu correximus, si qua prelo vitia obrepserant,*" etc. The title-page of the book is dated one year later than this bull, and is as follows: "*Biblia Sacra Vulgatæ editionis tribus tomis distincta. Romæ, ex typographiâ Apostolicâ Vaticanâ. M.D. XC.*" fol. After this comes a second title-page, which is engraved and represents Abraham's sacrifice. On its upper border are the words: "*Biblia Sacra Vulgatæ editionis ad concilii Tridentini præscriptum emendata et a Sixto V. P. M. recognita et approbata.*" Beneath is a border with the words: *accipe et devora.*

The work, from the condition in which it appeared, particularly under existing circumstances, afforded opportunity of finding fault with it to every one who wished to do so. Many passages, especially in the New Testament, were found covered over with small bits of paper on which the corrections were printed; others were erased, or merely altered with the pen. This, in a book which was to have a high and commanding authority, must have displeased members of the Romish Church, as well as Protestants.

Not long afterwards, a learned Englishman made a collection of these passages,<sup>2</sup> and another scholar enlarged the catalogue;<sup>3</sup> and by examining several copies any one might easily make a further contribution to it, for the alterations are not uniform in all the copies.

In the Royal Library at Vienna there are two copies; one is on very large, the other on somewhat smaller paper. In one of them, in Gen. 41: 10, (e. g.) the word *pecoribus* is not covered over; in the other, a bit of paper is pasted over it, on which is found *prioribus*. As to the New Testament, in both copies at Mark 10: 1 there is a bit of paper

<sup>1</sup> Præf. in Ed. Clem. VIII. "In multis" etc.

<sup>2</sup> "Bellum papale, sive concordia discors Sixti quinti et Clementis octavi circa Hieronymianam editionem, auctore Thoma James," etc. Londini, 1600. 4to.

<sup>3</sup> "Histoire de la Bible de Sixte quint par Prosper Marchand," in Schellhorn's "Amœnitates Litterar." Tom. IV. p. 433. seq.

with the word *inde*. In Acts 7: 8, *et Isaac et Jacob*, the last *et* is erased in one MS., and in the other the place is painted of a yellowish color. In Tit. 2: 2, *pudici* has been erased in one MS., and in the other changed into *pudici* with a pen. At Rev. 3: 7, one has a bit of paper pasted on with the word *scribe*; in the other the word *scribe* is printed correctly. In Rev. 3: 12, one reads *scribæ*; in the other there is a bit of paper on which *scribe* is printed. Everything is nearly as it was in Prosper Marchand's copy.

How it happened that the book appeared in this condition before a public so strongly disposed to criticise it with severity, we will not now enquire. Thus much, however, we can see, viz. that this prince, encompassed as he was by numerous and weighty affairs, did more than could have been expected of him, and that he was not so well served as he anticipated. Sixtus died in August of the same year, and left to his successors the honor of preparing a new work to take the place of this.

### § 128.

Gregory XIV undertook the task anew, and appointed for its execution a body of cardinals and learned men, among whom Bellarmine obtained precedence. Gregory did not see the work completed; but it appeared soon after Clement VIII., who succeeded him, was instated in the popedom.

There was, however, a great difficulty to surmount. Was it expedient to depreciate the Sixtine edition by declaring it faulty? Both the new work and the papal authority would certainly gain nothing by this in public estimation. Should it be pronounced correct? Why then prepare another? In this dilemma, Bellarmine is said to have found out a middle course, and to have proposed that all the blame should be laid upon the printer, so as to vindicate the reputation of Sixtus and his successors.

Sixtus is thus exculpated in the preface to this second edition: "*Quod cum jam esset excusum, et ut in lucem emitteretur, idem Pontifex (Sixtus) operam daret, animadvertens non pauca in sacra Biblia præli vitio irrepsisse, quæ iteratâ diligentia indigere viderentur, totum opus sub incudem revocandum censuit atque decrevit. Id vero cum morte præventus præstare non potuisset, Gregorius XIV,*" etc. Bellarmine was the author of the preface;<sup>1</sup> and it is said to have been the cause of his canonization.<sup>2</sup> Beyond a doubt the greater part of the corrections in the Sixtine Bible were attributable to the printer's mistakes; but it would be no more than we might expect from the learning and rash

<sup>1</sup> Vita del Cardinale Roberto Bellarmino, composta dal P. Giacomo Fuligatti, in Roma. 1624. 4to. capit. 13.

<sup>2</sup> Le Bret, Dissert. Theol. de usu versionis Lat. Vet. in Ecclesiâ Christ. Turing. 1786. §. 23. p. 54. That the statement is correct, is proved by the following book: "Voti degl. infrascritti eminentissimi Signori Cardinali, B. Gregorio Barbarigo, Gieronimo Casanate, Decio Azzolini, Domenico Passionei, nella causa della Beatificazione de venerabile servo di Dio Card. Roberto Bellarmino. Seconda edizione. In Ferrara 1762. Si vende in Venezia al insegne di Demosthene." Le Bret saw an earlier edition of it. (Venet. 1761.) The *Votum* of Card. Passionei is in MS. in the *Bibliotheca Angelica*, to which the Cardinal presented his valuable collection of books.

self-confidence of Sixtus, if he now and then opposed the opinion of the censors, and amended with his own hand against their judgment. But however this may be, so much is clear, either that it was not intended in the second edition to give the text of Sixtus as accurately as possible, or that the intention miscarried; for the edition contains several hundred deviations from the former.

The second edition, which was the model of the present Vulgate text, appeared, like the first, with two title-pages, one printed, the other engraved. The printed one is as follows: "*Biblia Sacra Vulgatæ editionis, Romæ ex Typographiâ Apostolicâ Vaticanâ. M. D. XCII.*" The engraved page is the same as that of the Sixtine edition; so is the title upon it: "*Biblia Sacra Vulgatæ editionis Sixti Quinti Pont. Max. jussu recognita atque edita.*" Beneath, *accipe et devora*. The *Præfatio ad Lectorem* comes next. "In multis magnisque beneficiis, etc." Then follows the *Decretum concilii Tridentini*; then the Bull: *Clemens P. octavus ad perpetuam rei memoriam*: "Cum sacrorum Bibliorum Vulgatæ editionis textus, etc." "dat. Romæ apud S. Petrum sub annulo piscatoris die 9. Novembris 1592."

In the following year, 1593, a quarto edition of it was issued from the Vatican Press. These two editions are not often met with; and the Sixtine edition is one of the greatest typographical rarities, either because but few copies were published, or because they were gradually called in,<sup>1</sup> or on both accounts.

### § 129.

The preface of Bellarmine is occupied principally in detailing the plan of the Censors and the rules they prescribed to themselves. Yet he has not taken pains always to give a clear and definite account of them.

One would think that the object was the restoration of the Vulgate to its original condition: "*Ipsam veterem, ac vulgatam editionem Lat. a mendis veterum libroriorum, nec non pravarum emendationum erroribus repurgatam, suæ pristinæ integritati ac puritati, quoad ejus fieri potuit, restituere.*" The text which Jerome (from whom the expression is borrowed,) calls *communem et vulgatam*, was that which was usual before his time.

In another place Bellarmine seems to assert, that the intention was to revise Jerome's Recension and introduce it into general use: "*Quare non immerito Catholica Ecclesia S. Hieronymum Doctorem maximum atque ad Scripturas sacras interpretandas divinitus excitatum ita celebrat, ut jam difficile non sit illorum omnium damnare judicium, qui vel tam eximii Doctoris lucubrationibus non acquiescunt, vel etiam meliora, aut certe paria se præstare confidunt. Cæterum ne tam fidelis translatio, etc.*"

This was actually the case, if, in determining the text, the censors consulted Rhabanus, Haymo, Anselm, Peter Damiani, and other writers whom they enumerate; for these follow in their works the Carolinian MSS., which exhibit Jerome's text as corrected by Alcuin.

<sup>2</sup> Le Bret Dissert. de usu vers. Lat. vet. in eccles. § 23. p. 53.



They, however, used very great caution; designedly passing over many things which required correction: "*In hac tamen pervulgatâ lectione sicut nonnulla consulto mutata, ita etiam alia, quæ mutanda videbantur, consulto immutata relictæ sunt.*"<sup>1</sup>

## GOTHIC VERSION.

## § 130.

For a long time before the thirty years' war broke out, the Abbey of Werden in Westphalia contained a MS. of the four Gospels, written in an old German dialect in letters of silver.<sup>2</sup> In order that this document might be withdrawn from the danger which threatened it, it was deposited for safe keeping with other valuables at Prague; but here, not many months before the peace, it fell into the hands of the Swedes when, in 1748, under General Königsmark, they unexpectedly entered Kleinseite, or Little Prague.<sup>3</sup> It was now deposited in the Royal Library at Stockholm, and was subsequently, it is probable, presented to the celebrated Isaac Voss by Queen Christina, whose special favor he enjoyed. Others will have it that he made a present of it to himself.

During the Westphalian negotiations for peace, this valuable document came to the knowledge of Count Magnus Gabriel De la Gardie, who purchased it of Voss for 400 rix dollars, and gave it for safe keeping to the University of Upsal, where it is now preserved.

With the MS. the Count also deposited a very faithful transcript of it, in which the original was sedulously copied in the same number of pages, line for line and letter for letter. One Derrer (it is not known when or where) executed this toilsome task. I am convinced by careful investigation that he was not the famous lawyer of that name who

<sup>1</sup> The history of the Latin version, especially of its latest period, has been presented by Dr. Leander Van Ess in a learned work, entitled: "*Pragmatisch-kritische Geschichte der Vulgata im Allgemeinen, und zunächst in Beziehung auf das Trientische Decret.*" Tübingen, 1824." 8vo.

<sup>2</sup> We have the history of this MS. in Ihre's "*Dissertat. I. de Cod. Argent.*" § 14, 15, and in Zahn's "*Historisch-kritische Einleit. in Ulfilas Biblübersetzung,*" p. 39—46.

<sup>3</sup> Such is the Swedish account, to which I give the preference above other reports and surmises. (Ihre, *Dissert. I. loc. cit.*) Ihre considers the charge against Voss of an unauthorized appropriation of the MS. as by no means proved, although he must have known what Nettelblatt, 36 years before, had published respecting it. How, moreover, could Junius, if his nephew had stolen the book, say in the dedication to De la Gardie which he prefixed to his Ulfilas: "*Habeo sane quod cælo imputem; siquidem intelligo immortalis Dei nutu memoratum codicem ad manus meas perlatum?*" Or, if Voss was a thief, how could Ulitius say in the *Carmen*, addressed to De la Gardie, which is prefixed to Junius' *Glossar. Gothic*:

"Si Vossî memor est, et honorat Suedia nomen,  
(Lucidius docto non micat orbe jubar)  
Tantus hic et tanti nec avunculus esse nepotis  
Ignotus vestris, neve latere, potest.  
Ille Palatinis pluteis quæ promiserat ante,  
Hic tibi nunc cultu splendidiore refert."

adorned our University during the first half of the 16th century. This transcript was destroyed in the great fire at Upsal in 1702.

### § 131.

Junius obtained the use of the Codex from his nephew, and published it in 1665, in Gothic letters cast expressly for the purpose. Whether Junius found Derrer's transcript already in existence, or himself caused it to be made, is uncertain; but that he industriously consulted the Codex itself, we are told by Thomas Marshall, who lived with Junius and assisted him while the work was preparing for the press.<sup>1</sup> Junius even complains of the difficulty he had in tracing and making out the faded characters.<sup>2</sup>

In 1621, Stirnhelm published a second edition, from Derrer's transcript, in Latin characters. He, however, sometimes consulted the original.<sup>3</sup> In 1684, a reprint of Junius' edition appeared at Amsterdam with the same type, the same title, and in the same form. Perhaps there was only a new title-page printed, in order to sell the remainder of the first edition under the name of another publisher. Archbishop Benzel afterwards took a fancy to the ancient document, and made preparations for a new edition, but did not live to see the fruit of his toil. Edward Lye published the edition with ability and fidelity. It seems that the Archbishop even purposed to have the whole Codex copied in woodcuts, of which I have in my possession a well executed specimen.<sup>4</sup> Meanwhile Ihre, who lived in the neighborhood of the valuable document, devoted his attention to it; but, as his eyesight failed him, he employed a young man, Ehrich Sotberg, to compare the editions of Junius and Benzel with the original repeatedly, and published the amendments thus obtained in a work entitled "*Ulphilas illustratus*."<sup>5</sup> He also caused a very exact transcript of the Codex to be made for his own use.

Not succeeding in executing a new edition, he sent this transcript to Büsching, that he might prepare one from it. From Büsching the transcript passed to Heynatz. Heynatz lent it to Zahn, a clergyman, who fortunately succeeded in publishing his *Ulfilas* from it.<sup>6</sup> The text

<sup>1</sup> At the end of his Notes on Mark, p. 44.

<sup>2</sup> In the preface to the annexed *Gothicum Glossarium*.

<sup>3</sup> Ihre, Dissert. I. De. Cod. Argent. § 15.

<sup>4</sup> *Ulfiliani codicis sculptura lignea edendi specimen Benzelianum*. Lincopiæ excusum curâ Friderici Arendt. MDCCCV. Cal. Jan.

<sup>5</sup> This and several treatises of Ihre relating to the Codex, its grammar, idioms, etc. have been published, together with several others on this subject, by Büsching, the geographer, in one collection: "*Johannis ab Ihre scripta versionem Ulphilanam et linguam Moeso-Gothicam illustrantia . . . , und cum aliis scriptis similis argumenti, edita ab Ant. Frid. Büsching. Berolini. 1773.*" 4to.

<sup>6</sup> All the editions enumerated are derived from the same source. As each editor states on the title-page what he has done to facilitate the explanation and better understanding of the document, we will here cite the editions with the title-pages entire.

1. "Quatuor D. N. Jesu Christi Evangeliorum Versiones perantiquæ duæ, Gothica scilicet et Anglo-Saxonica, quarum illam ex celeberrimo Codice Argentæo nunc primum deprompsit Franc. Junius, T. F., hanc ex codicibus MSS. collatis emendatius recudi curavit Thomas Mareschallus, Anglus: cuius etiam observationes in utramque versionem subnectuntur. Accessit et

is given with care ; the grammatical and critical observations subjoined in the lower margin are brief, to the point, and well-conceived, and the whole of the rich apparatus of the book is valuable.

§ 132.

The original is called *Codex Argenteus* from its letters, which are large, regular and beautiful uncial characters of silver, on very fine purple-colored parchment, in large quarto. The initial lines of the Gospels and the first line of every section are in gold letters. Below, between columns drawn in barbarous taste according to neither of the known orders of architecture, are inserted the Canons of Eusebius, and at the side are appended the numbers referring to them. The Gospels are in the following order : Matthew, John, Luke, Mark.

The letters do not appear to have been written with a pen or reed, but to have been impressed by means of carved or cast stamps, nearly in the same way as book-binders put titles upon the backs of books in gold or silver. The perfect uniformity of the letters, the indentations which they make in the page, the traces of paste sometimes visible between the silver and the parchment—all this, of which Ihre has adduced evidence, and of which he gives an account in the preface to "*Ulphilas illustratus*," renders such a supposition credible, whatever may be said to the contrary by hasty travellers and superficial observers.

Some are disposed to ascribe these appearances to ink ; against which I must observe that not long since I saw the purple MSS. written in

Glossarium Gothicum : cui præmittitur alphabetum Gothicum, Runicum etc. opera. ejusdem Franc. Junii. Dord. 1635." in 4to.

2. "D. N. Jesu Christi SS. Evangelia ab Ulfila Gothorum in Mœsia episcopo, circa annum a nato Christo CCCLX. ex Græco Gothice translata, nunc cum parallelis versionibus, Sueo-Gothicâ, Norrœanâ seu Islandicâ, et vulgatâ Latinâ edita, accedit Franc. Junii glossarium Gothicum, linguâ Sueo-Gothicâ modernâ et antiquâ locupletatum et illustratum, curâ et studio Georgii Stirnhelmii. Stockholm. 1671." 4to.

3. Amstelodami. 1648. This has the same title as the first.

4. "Sacrorum Evangeliorum versio Gothica, ex codice argenteo emendata atque suppleta, cum interpretatione Latinâ et annotationibus Erici Benzeli non ita pridem Archiep. Upsaliensis edidit, observationes suas adjecit, et grammaticam Gothicam præmisit Edwardus Lye A. M. Oxonii a typographeo Clarendoniano MDCCL." 4to. It is well printed with the characters of the *Cod. argent.*, and is scarce.

5. "Ulfilas Gothische Bibelübersetzung, die älteste germanische Urkunde, nach Ihrens Text, mit einer grammatisch-wörtlichen lateinischen Uebersetzung zwischen den Zeilen, sammt einer Sprachlehre und einem Glossar, ausgearbeitet von Friederich Karl Fulda, weiland Pfarrer in Ensingen im Württembergischen ; das Glossar umgearbeitet von W. F. H. Reinwald, Herzogl. Sächs. Rath und Oberbibliothekar in Meiningen, und den Text nach Ihrens genauer Abschrift der silbernen Handschrift in Upsal, sorgfältig berichtigt, die Uebersetzung und Sprachlehre verbessert und ergänzt, auch mit Ihrens lateinischer Uebersetzung neben dem Texte, und mit einer vollständigen Kritik und Erläuterung in Anmerkungen unter demselben, sammt einer historisch-kritischen Einleitung versehen und herausgegeben von Johann Christian Zahn, Prediger in Delitz an der Saale bey Weissenfels in Sachsen. Auf Kosten des Herausgebers. Weissenfels. 1805." 4to.

silver which are at Brescia and Verona, and very beautiful fragments of Matthew's Gospel in the Vatican Library, and nowhere discovered any indentations or appearance of paste.

The pages of this MS. do not follow one another in regular order, and many are wanting. Matthew begins at 5: 15; and there is a chasm from 6: 32 to 7: 12. From 10: 1—23, there is a second. From 11: 25, there is a chasm as far as 26: 70. Then all the last chapter is wanting. In Mark are wanting, from 6: 31—54; from 12: 38—13: 18, from 13: 29—14: 5, from 14: 16—41, from 16: 12 to the end. In Luke, from 10: 30—14: 9, from 16: 24—17: 3, from 20: 37 to the end. John begins with 5: 45; then there are chasms from 11: 47—12: 1, from 12: 49—13: 11, from 19: 13 to the end. Besides this, individual verses have here and there suffered mutilations which we will not here enumerate.

### § 133.

Some years after the publication of Lye's edition of the Gospels, Counsellor Knittel, in examining a MS. in the Library at Wolfenbüttel, which was written about the 9th century in Spain, and contains the well-known *Origines* of Isidore of Seville, observed that beneath some pages of this MS. there was concealed an older writing which had been washed off to write Isidore's work in its stead. After much pains he succeeded in deciphering the older characters. Now these were fortunately fragments of the Epistle to the Romans, in the same language and character as the Codex of Upsal, with the old Latin version antecedent to Jerome by the side of the text. The fragments discovered are the following: Rom. 11: 33, 34, 35, 36; 12: 1—5 and 17—21; 13: 1—5; 14: 9—20; and, lastly, 15: 3—13, inclusive. Knittel published them in 1762, with notes and explanations.<sup>1</sup>

The little already possessed of the Epistles of Paul was highly prized as a gift of good fortune, and it was scarcely hoped that there would be any important increase of it in future, when, in 1817, Angelo Maio gave an account of considerable portions of the Gothic version which he had discovered in the Ambrosian Library.

Beneath the Homilies of Gregory the Great on Ezekiel, written in the 8th century, he had perceived older characters, like those of *Cod. Argenteus*, which had been washed off. Closer scrutiny afforded him the joyful assurance that he had obtained important fragments, in the Gothic language, of all Paul's Epistles, except the two to the Thessalonians and the Epistle to the Hebrews. A second MS., of the 9th century, perhaps, which contained Jerome's Exposition of Isaiah, like-

<sup>1</sup> "Ulphilæ Versionem Gothicam nonnullorum capitum epistolæ Pauli ad Romanos e littera MS. rescripti bibliothecæ Guelferbytanæ cum variis monumentis ineditis eruit, commentatus est, deditque foras Franc. Ant. Knittel. Brunovici. 1762." 4to. Ihre published them again, with new remarks, under the following title: "Fragmenta versionis Ulphilanæ, continentia particulas aliquot epistolæ Pauli ad Romanos, haud pridem ex codice rescripto biblioth. Guelferb. eruta, et a Fr. Ant. Knittel, Archidiacon. edita, nunc cum aliquot annotationibus typis reddita a Joanne Ihre etc. Upsaliæ. 1763." 4to. This last is reprinted in Büsching's collection, P. 97. seq.—Zahn, also, has appended it to his *Ulfilas*.



wise concealed the Gothic text of Paul's Epistles, excepting the Epistle to the Romans and the Hebrews. The Pauline Epistles thus concealed beneath Jerome's work are not a supplementary portion of the former, but were originally an independent Codex.

At the end of a Latin MS. of the four Gospels Maio found bound with it a leaf from an older Codex. On this leaf, likewise, containing a fragment of the Latin version of Matthew, he perceived Gothic characters which had been partially expunged. It contained two fragments of Matthew, viz. 25: 38—26: 3, and 26: 65—27th Chap.; the first of which, and the first six verses of the second, (26: 65—71,) supply chasms in the *Cod. Argent.*

In the first mentioned MS. of the Homilies of Gregory, there was found also, with the Pauline Epistles, a fragment of a Gothic calendar partially expunged. In other MSS. were discovered some fragments of the Old Testament, and a Gothic Homily, rich in biblical quotations, from which were obtained some verses that are wanting in *Cod. Argent.*

Count Carlo Ottavio Castilioni took the most lively interest in the discovery, and assisted Angelo Maio by his knowledge of the German language, in the labors required by the publication. Both jointly wrote a detailed account of the discoveries which had been made, described the MSS. in which these treasures were hidden, and presented specimens of the Gothic documents discovered.<sup>1</sup> When Maio was called to the Vatican Library, and obeyed the call thither, the whole burden of the work fell upon Count Castilioni, and on this account the publication has been delayed longer than was anticipated by the two learned scholars, and longer than we could wish.

### § 134.

The language of these documents is that of an ancient people who formerly dwelt very far north; for they were accustomed to reckon their years by winters. Twelve years, in Matt. 9: 20 and Luke 2: 42, are TVALIB VINTRUS; so in Luke 8: 42. Having no word for lilies, they made use of the general term BLOMANS, (Germ. *Blumen*, *flowers*,) in Matt. 8: 28.

They, however, had come in contact with the Greeks; so that certain Greek words and expressions were current among them, which the translator of the Gospels could retain, even when they might be translated into his own language. It is certain that the word *Lohn* was in his language; it occurs in Luke 6: 32, and elsewhere: WHA IZVIS LAUNE IST. Yet where *μισθός* occurs in the Greek text, he almost always retains it as a familiar term. (MIZDO, Matt. 5: 46. 6: 3. Luke 6: 23, &c.) His nation had a word denoting *basket*; it appears in Mark 8: 19, John 6: 13, TAINJONS, or *Zainen* in the popular language of our country. Yet the translator sometimes used instead of it the Greek word *συνιδας*, SPVREIDANS. (Mark 8: 8, 20.) For a

<sup>1</sup> Ulphilæ partium ineditarum in Ambrosianis palimpsestis ab Angelo Maio repertarum specimen conjunctis curis ejusdem Maii et Caroli Octavii Castilionei editum. Mediolani Regiis typis MDCCCXIX. 4to.

*royal mandate*, they had a technical word derived from the Greek γράφω, GAGREFTS. (Luke 2: 1.) They had expressions for *dinner* and *supper* (Luke 14: 12., Mark 6: 21); but this does not prevent him from using the Greek δογή for a banquet, (Luke 5: 29,) δογήν μεγάλην—DAUHT MIKILA. It was probably only from the want of a suitable word that he could not avoid the Greek θυμίαμα, THUMIAMIN, in Luke 1: 10.

This people, however, came in closer contact with nations which spoke the Latin language, as is evident from the many Latin words which to all appearance were quite common among the readers of this version. *To seat one's self at table*, is with them AMAKUMBIAN (Mark 2: 15. 6: 22, Luke 5: 29, and in 7: 49, MITANAKUMBIAN); *drinking-vessels* are AURKIE, *urcei* (Mark 7: 5); *vinegar* is AKETIS (Matt. 27: 48., Mark 15: 36); a money-chest is ARKA (John 13: 29); *gold*, too, is called AIZ, *æs* (Mark 6: 8). *Bandages* are FASKIE (John 11: 44); *Soldiers*, MILITONDANS (Luke 3: 14, where also the word ANNOM for *annona* occurs); a *prison* is termed KARKARA (Matt. 5: 25. 11: 2. Mark 6: 17). Some expressions are common to both Greeks and Romans, as AROMATA, Mark 16: 1, PARAKLETUS, John 14: 25.

Several of these words might have been avoided by the translator, and have been rendered by such as were peculiar to his own language, if he had not been convinced that they would all be well understood by his countrymen. They too seated themselves or reclined at meals; they too had waterpots; they had a peculiar expression for gold, of frequent occurrence; they too had a word designating a soldier; and hence nothing could induce him to have recourse to Latin words, but the *usus loquendi* of his nation and the knowledge that such expressions were current and intelligible among them.

So much of the history of this people is contained in their very language. If we now look at the various German tribes, we shall find none which had so much intercourse with both Greeks and Romans, that it could have had such an influence upon their language, except the Goths. After the time of Constantine, they were very closely connected with the Eastern empire, and subsequently took possession of the Roman provinces along the Danube, from which they issued to establish two new kingdoms in the Roman territory.

### § 135.

Certain learned men probably paid no attention to these considerations, when they broached the idea that this version might be Franconian.

The Franks had no version of the Bible in their language until the time of Otfried von Weissenburg. Besides, the structure of the Franconian language is very different from that of the language of the *Cod. Argent.*, particularly in the union of the verbs *to be* and *to have*, as auxiliaries in the formation of certain tenses; in the formation of the passive voice; and in respect to the use of the dual number, which is unknown to the Franconian. When this Introduction first appeared, it was necessary that all this should be treated in detail, and much more

taken into consideration, in order to determine the people of Germany to whom the two documents at Upsal and Wolfenbüttel belonged. We are now spared these details; for the point has been since determined beyond dispute.

The certificate preserved in the Episcopal archives at Arezzo, containing a subscription of five lines in letters similar to those of the *Cod. Argent.*, has long been known. The first who published it was Doni;<sup>1</sup> he did not, however, adhere closely to the characters, but altered them so as to be more like printed letters. Lye, Knittel and Ihre, who confided in him, repeated his errors. The Abate Marini, a respectable scholar, examined the original anew, and published it with great accuracy.<sup>2</sup> We see from this edition that the characters are really the same as those of the *Cod. Argent.*; not indeed elegantly written, but made by an unskilful penman. But neither does this document afford us any explanation as to the people among whom the characters were current; for it contains no trace or hint of what nation the persons were who executed it.

The valuable relic at Naples is more decisive. It was formerly in the archives *della SS. Annunciata*, and is now in the Royal Library at Naples, in the Hall of MSS., where it is suspended behind glass in a frame at a window which fronts the principal street. Sabbatini first published it.<sup>3</sup> Ihre attempted to explain it,<sup>4</sup> and after him Zahn.<sup>5</sup> But neither was this relic copied with care and fidelity. Marini<sup>6</sup> first gained the credit of giving an accurate representation of it. Lastly, Count Siemekowski had it copied anew from the original and engraved; but I could find no copies of it in the print-shops or bookstores of Italy.

This document is a deed of sale, on Egyptian papyrus, of about the year 551, signed by all the clergy of the Gothic church of St. Anastasia (*aclicie Gotice Sancte Anastasie*). Of the signatures, which occupy 66 lines, 10 lines are written in the characters which were called Gothic, only by conjecture till this document was discovered. From this we learn what people possessed these characters. They are by no means beautifully written; yet the characters and the language of the Upsal Codex are not to be mistaken.

Among the confirmatory documents we ought to reckon the fragments discovered by Maio of a calendar written with the same letters as the

<sup>1</sup> Donii inscriptiones antiquæ, edit. ab Ant. Fr. Gorio. Florentiæ, 1731, p. 469.

<sup>2</sup> "I Papyri diplomatici raccolti ed illustrati d' all' Abate Gaetano Marini, primo custode della Bib. Vat. e Prefeto degli archivi secreti della santa sede in Roma MDCCCV. nella Stamparia della S. Congreg. de prop. fide. N. CXVIII. p. 179, 80.

<sup>3</sup> "Il vetusto calendario Neapolitano scoperto; con varie note illustrato dal Ludovico Sabbatini d'Anfora Neap. 1744." 4to. p. 101—106.

<sup>4</sup> Monument. vet. linguæ Ostrogoth. Neapoli . . . repertum, illustratum a Jo. Ihre in "Novis Actis Societat. Scient. Upsaliensis. Vol. III. Ups. 1780." p. 1—31.

<sup>5</sup> Versuch, einer Erklärung der gothischen Sprachüberreste in Neapel und Arezzo, als eine Einladungsschrift und Beylage zum Ulfilas. Von J. Chr. Zahn. Braunschweig. 1804." 8vo.

<sup>6</sup> "I papyri diplomatici raccolti," &c. N. CXIX. p. 180, 81, 82.

Epistles of Paul discovered by him. The pages contain the last eight days of June and the whole of July. Two festivals disclose the people among whom these fragments originated; one, on the 23d of June, "of the martyrs put to death among the Goths, and of Fritharik," the other, on the 29th of the same month: "in memory of the martyrs who were burnt with Vereka the priest and Batwin the minister of the Gothic church."<sup>1</sup>

As to the other points, the calendar only renders probable what is made certain by the document at Naples.

### § 136.

Except the Silver Codex at Upsal and the pages discovered by Knittel at Wolfenbüttel, all the documents of this kind are found in Italy. Probably even the Silver Codex at Upsal was executed in Italy. MSS. written in silver letters on purple-colored parchment, with initial lines of gold, seem to be peculiar to that country.

The splendid MS. in the Royal Library at Vienna, written on purple in silver and gold, containing the Gospels of Luke and Mark, was formerly possessed by the Augustines of St. John de Carbonara at Naples. The MSS. of the four Gospels described by Blanchini (one at Brescia, *Codex Brixienensis argenteus*, the other at Verona, *Cod. Argent. Veronens.*) are well known. They are preserved in both places in the library of the cathedral. In the cathedral-library at Peruggia there are fragments of Luke's Gospel, written in silver on purple. (*Blanchini, Evangeliar. quadruplex. T. II. p. DLXI.*)

The Silver Codex of Upsal arranges the Gospels in the following order: Matthew, John, Luke, Mark. They stand in the same order in the MSS. of Brescia and Verona, in the Codex of St. Eusebius at Vercelli, and (as respects Luke and Mark) in the above mentioned MS. at Vienna.

Beneath the Gospels of the Upsal Codex stand the Canons of Eusebius. The margin, in which the four Evangelists are separated into sections by the Ammonian or Eusebian numbers, is divided by columns into seven compartments. The columns are united above by arches so as to resemble an architectural design. The capitals are not executed according to any one of the usual orders, but in that barbarous taste which we denominate Gothic. Now this design and this decoration of the capitals are found exactly in the same way below the Latin Gospels in the *Codex Argenteus Brixienensis* above mentioned.<sup>2</sup> Such casual circumstances, not the result of any rule, but depending upon the customs of a region or a people, are satisfactory evidence of national relationship.

If the Upsal Codex was written, as the preceding considerations render very probable, in Italy, it must have originated, at the latest, in the beginning of the 6th century, before the Gothic supremacy in Italy was destroyed and the whole nation almost extirpated.

<sup>1</sup> Ulphilæ partium ineditarum specimen. p. 26. 27.

<sup>2</sup> Comp. the representation in Büsching's *Analectis Ulphilanis*, (Dissert. I. De Cod. argent., p. 189) with Bianchini, *Vindiciæ canonicar. scriptur. Vulgatae editionis etc.* Romæ 1740. fol. p. CCCLXXXI.



Only the Wolfenbüttel fragments of the Epistle to the Romans appear to have had their origin in Spain. When they were expunged, the *Origines* of Isidore of Seville were written<sup>1</sup> over them in Latin characters, such as are found, according to Knittel, in Spanish MSS. of the 10th century.

## § 137.

Having thus satisfied ourselves that we possess the greater part of the New Testament in the language of the Goths, we may enter upon some inquiries in respect to that people. When they first attracted the particular notice of history, they were dwelling on the eastern bank of the Dniester and along the Black Sea, within uncertain limits to the north and northeast. Another portion of the same people had settled down between the Dniester and Pruth, as far as to the mouths of the Danube. The latter are called Visigoths, and the former Ostrogoths. Issuing from these regions, they molested the Roman provinces, after the time of Caracalla, or served the emperors against other nations for pay. Frequently, in order to keep them quiet, it was agreed to pay them annual sums of money, under the pretext of alliance. If the stipulated sums were withheld, an irruption into the Roman territory was the certain consequence. Sometimes, after they discovered their advantage, they plundered the country even when the sums had been paid.

Under the indolent Gallienus such visits were made, not only by the Goths, but by the barbarous tribes on every side. It is to these irruptions in the reign of Gallienus that the conversion of the barbarians, and particularly of the Goths, is ascribed by ecclesiastical historians. There were sometimes Christian teachers among the many prisoners whom they carried away; through these they became acquainted with the doctrines of Christianity.<sup>1</sup>

Their expeditions extended into Pontus, as we learn from the ecclesiastical proceedings instituted by Gregory of Neo-Cæsarea (called Thaumaturgus, or worker of miracles,) against wicked Christians who bought the spoils of the country from the *Βοράδοις* and *Ιόδοις*, betrayed to them the situation of treasures, or assisted in carrying them away.<sup>2</sup>

Mention is made by several historians of the expedition or rather expeditions into Pontus. "The Goths," says Eutropius, "have ravaged Pontus and Asia."<sup>3</sup> Another writer says: "The Scythians, or a part of the Goths, ravaged Asia, came to Heraclea, and at last to Pontus, where they were defeated."<sup>4</sup> The account given by Zosimus seems to me the best. Those whom Gregory called *Βοράδοι* he calls *Βόραιοι*. They penetrated into Pontus, but were driven back by the Roman commander Successianus. As soon, however, as they learned that he was

<sup>1</sup> Sozom. H. Eccles. L. II. c. 6. This is stated more expressly by Philostorg. H. Eccles. L. II. c. 5.

<sup>2</sup> Beveregii Synodicon. sive Pantactæ Canon. T. II. Oxon. 1672. p. 24—29. Epistola Synodica Greg. Thaumaturg. cum Comment. Balsamon. et Zonar.

<sup>3</sup> Eutrop. Breviar. L. IX. c. 8.

<sup>4</sup> Trebelius Pollio in Gallieno, c. 12, 13.

recalled from the province of Pontus, they came again, took Trapezunt, and returned home of their own accord when they had plundered to their satisfaction.<sup>1</sup>

These events were the occasion of their conversion to Christianity, and in a short time it gained many adherents among them; for at the great Nicene Council the decrees were subscribed by Theophilus Bosphoritanus, Metropolitan of the Goths.<sup>2</sup>

After the Council of Nice, the Goths obtained a new missionary, named Audius, a man of strict habits of life, who, however, resisted the decree in regard to Easter, and was banished from the country by Constantine for his open contumacy. He now travelled to Scythia, and into the very interior of Gothland, imparting instruction and even founding considerable monastic establishments both of males and females.<sup>3</sup> One of the Gothic chiefs, however, hated the faith of the Christians, and violently persecuted those who adopted it, on the ground that it was the religion of the Roman rulers; but he could not prevent the extension of the faith nor destroy the sources of instruction.<sup>4</sup>

Such, nearly, was the state of things, when they were compelled to abandon their country by the pressure of a wild horde of greater barbarians than themselves. The Huns expelled the Ostrogoths; and these, urged on upon the Visigoths, pressed upon the latter and drove them onward before them.

Forced to yield to the impulse, they had no other means of safety, but to send an embassy to Valens, petitioning that they might be admitted into the Roman dominions on the Danube. At the head of the embassy was Ulfila, a Gothic Bishop.<sup>5</sup> In order to ensure success, Ulfila promised for himself and his countrymen, to adopt the doctrines of Arius, which had been ardently espoused by Valens and those about him.<sup>6</sup> The Emperor granted their request; they were soon followed by the other half of the Western Goths, who, like their brethren, were transplanted to the provinces of Thrace and Mœsia.

But scarcely, says one historian, had they reached their new possessions, when a division arose among them. Athanarich, who was disaffected towards the Christian doctrines, would not tolerate them among his followers and persecuted with severity all who professed them. Frithigern, an adherent to the doctrines of Christianity, thinking himself bound to protect the persecuted, sent Ulfila to seek assistance of the Emperor and obtained it.<sup>7</sup>

This last persecution and embassy would seem, however, to have been referred to so late a period only by mistake, and to be the same as those before mentioned. Sozomen alone mentions this second perse-

<sup>1</sup> Zosim. L. I. c. 31, 32, 33.

<sup>2</sup> He subscribed his name to the Acts of the Council (according to Latin historians) as *Theophilus Gothorum Metropolis* and *Theophilus Bosphoritanus*. (Comp. Socrat. H. Eccl. L. II. c. 41.)

<sup>3</sup> Epiphan. Hær. LXX. § 14. p. 827. ed. Colon.

<sup>4</sup> Epiphan. loc. cit. § 15. p. 828.

<sup>5</sup> Sozomen. Hist. Eccl. L. VI. c. 37.

<sup>6</sup> Sozomen. L. II. c. 6. Theodoret. H. Eccl. L. IV. c. 37.

<sup>7</sup> Sozomen. loc. cit.

cution, and he takes no notice of the first. Other writers mention but one persecution, which occurred while the Goths still dwelt in their own country and were still orthodox. To this period it is assigned by Epiphanius, from whom we have derived the preceding account, by Socrates, the historian,<sup>1</sup> and by Augustine, who assigns it to a period antecedent to the rise of Arianism.<sup>2</sup> If Ulfila was despatched to the Emperor on account of this persecution, to implore his assistance against the oppressor Athanarich, it was the first mission of the Gothic Bishop, and facilitated the second, when he came to request a place of abode for his ejected countrymen.

Valens, as we have said, admitted the Goths, and they were provided for. Some time after, however, eastern affairs having called Valens to a distance, they were, in the absence of the emperor, so grossly ill treated by one of his generals and the governor of Thrace, that the aggrieved nation suddenly arose, rebelled, and defeated their oppressors.<sup>3</sup> They then applied to their own use the Roman arms which they had taken from the vanquished, and became doubly formidable.

Valens hastened from Asia to punish them. Although they were in a condition to meet him on the field of battle, they sent an ambassador to apologise for them and conciliate Valens. The historian denominates the person who was entrusted with this commission, *Christiani ritus presbyter*. Probably Ulfila stood for the third time in the capacity of ambassador. But the fate of Valens was determined (proceeds the historian); a battle ensued and the emperor was left dead on the field.<sup>4</sup> From this time the Goths were more secure in their possessions, and had they known the value of their victory, they would not have suffered themselves to be sent away with presents from the gates of Constantinople.

### § 138.

The Bishop of the Goths, whom the ancient writers sometimes call Ulfilas, sometimes Wulfilas, and who is well known to us by what he accomplished, is proclaimed by the unanimous voice of history the inventor of the Gothic alphabet and the translator of the sacred books of the Old and New Testament.<sup>5</sup> The language of ancient writers is so general as to imply that he translated all the Sacred Scriptures, *τὰς θείας γραφὰς, ἱερὰς βίβλους, divinas scripturas*. Philostorgius alone makes an excep-

<sup>1</sup> Socrat. H. Eccl. L. IV. c. 33.

<sup>2</sup> Augustin. De Civ. Dei L. XVIII. c. 52.—“Nisi forte non est persecutio computanda, quando rex Gothorum in ipsa Gothia persecutus est Christianos crudelitate mirabili, cum ibi non essent nisi Catholici, quorum plurimi martyrio coronati sunt: sicut a quibusdam fratribus, qui tunc illic pueri fuerant, et se ista vidisse incunctanter recordabantur, audivimus.”

<sup>3</sup> Ammian. Marcellin. L. XXXI. c. 4.

<sup>4</sup> Ammian. Marcellin. Hist. L. XXXI. c. 12.

<sup>5</sup> Socrates H. Eccles. L. IV. c. 27 (according to some editions, 33). Sozomen. L. VI. c. 37. Cassiodor. Hist. Tripart. L. VIII. c. 13. Jornandes, De reb. Goth. c. 51. Heupelii Dissert. de Ulfila, Witteberg, 1693. Essbergii Ulphilas Gothor. Episcopus. Holmiæ. 1700. both in Büsching's collection. Benzeli Præfat. to the Gothic Gospels, edited by Edward Lye.

tion in regard to the book of Kings, saying that Ulfila regarded it as imprudent to put into the hands of a warlike nation a military history which might inflame their imagination.<sup>1</sup> Were the historic credit of Philostorgius less questionable than it is, it might nevertheless be objected that there was equal reason why Ulfilas should not have translated Joshua, Judges, and indeed a great part of Moses' writings, as well as other books.

Before we pass to the question when Ulfila undertook his translation, we must correct another mistake which disfigures the history of his life. The same Philostorgius represents the bishop as a distinguished man as early as the time of Constantine the Great, and introduces him into the Nicene Council.<sup>2</sup> He confounds Constantinus with Constantius, and the Nicene Council with one at Constantinople, which, through the influence of Acacius, passed resolutions that were not favorable to the orthodox doctrines. In this, however, Ulfila faithfully adhered to the doctrines of the fathers. I quote the words of Sozomenus: *Ἐπὶ δὲ τῆς Κωνσταντίου βασιλείας ἀπερισκέπτως οἶμαι τοῖς ἀμφὶ Ἐυδόξιον καὶ Ἀκάκιον τῆς ἐν Κωνσταντινπόλει συνόδου διέμεινε κοινωνῶν τοῖς ἱερέυσι τῶν ἐν Νικαίᾳ συνελθόντων.* (L. VI. c. 37.)

Although perhaps he was engaged in public affairs at an earlier period, he did not translate the Sacred Scriptures till after he removed with his countrymen to their new residence on this side of the Danube. This fact is attested by the historian Socrates,<sup>3</sup> and the language and characters of the version afford clear proofs of it. Some of the letters composing his Gothic alphabet were borrowed from the Roman characters, viz. *d, h, s* and *f*. The many Latin words (§. 134) which he has adopted in his version, imply that his countrymen were residing in the Roman provinces, and had thus become familiar with the signification of such words.

### § 139.

The translation was made from the Greek text. The orthography observed in it is borrowed from the Greek. The *I* is generally written *EI*: *SOKJIS*, *thou seekest*, is generally written *SOKJEIS*. *SOKITH*, *he seeks*, is still oftener written *SOKEITH*. The Greeks pronounced *γ* before *γ*, or *κ*, like *v*; and this custom is shown in the orthography of the Gothic version. I will give instances of it, retaining the Greek *I* as in the Codex: *INNATTAITH THAIR AITVU DAUR. UNTE BRAID DAUR JA RUMS VITS SA BRITTANDA IN FRALUSTAI*. "Enter ye in at the strait gate; for wide (is) the gate and broad (is) the way that leadeth to destruction." (Matt. 7: 13). This single verse affords us three examples. Take in addition, Matt. 6: 31, *DRITKAM*, *to drink*; 10: 42, *TADRATKEITH*, *he gives to drink*; Mark 2: 16, *DRITFKITH*, *he drinks*; and, from the fragments of the Epistle to the Romans, 12: 20, *DRATKEI*, *drink*; 15: 15, *IATTIS*, *thou goest*.

<sup>1</sup> Philostorg. H. Eccles. L. 2. c. 5.

<sup>2</sup> Philostorg. loc. cit.

<sup>3</sup> Socrat. L. IV. c. 33.



This is proved yet further by the care with which the translator exhibits the etymological sense of particular words. In Mark 12: 33, he renders *όλοκαυτώματα*, exactly in accordance with its etymology, **AL-ABRUNSTE**; in John 7: 3, *σκηνοπηγία*, **HLETHRASTAKEINS**, *the fastening of tents*; John 10: 22, *ἐγκαίνια*, **INNJUGITHA**, compounded of the words *in* and *jung*, as the Greek of *ἐν* and *καίνος*. In Luke 1: 51, where all the Latin MSS. have *superbos* (*Vercellens. Veronens. Brixians. Corbei.*), he translates *ὑπερηγάνους* by **MIKILTHUHTANS**, in order to imitate the *ὑπὲρ* and *γαίνομαι*. In Luke 1: 1, where the Latin versions incorrectly render *πεπληροφορημένων* by *completæ sunt*, he presents the sense and the etymology accurately: **GAFULLAVEISIDONS**. So in Mark 14: 56, where the Latin translator was obliged to use at least two words for *ἑψευδομαρτύρουν*, he exhibits its composition very happily by one word, **GALIUGVEITVODIDEDUN**. Immediately after, too, (v. 58,) where in Latin two words are necessarily used for *ἄχειροποίητον*, *non manufactum*, he uses, like the Greek, but one word, **UNHANDUVAURHTA**.

The translator, further, has confounded words in such a way that he must have had the Greek before him. Thus, in Luke 3: 14, he mistook **APKEISΘE** for **APXEΣΘE**. The word **VALDAN** exists in the Franconian and Anglo-Saxon dialects, in the sense which we give it now-a-days, and it is found in composition in the Gothic in Mark 10: 42, **GAVALDAND**, *governing*. Had Lye and Ihre here thought what would be the corresponding Greek word, and then compared it with that with which Luke used, they would not have been perplexed by this passage. Even the Gothic readers endeavored to amend their version here, probably from the Latin MSS.; for in the margin are the words **GANOHIDAI SIJUTH**, as though they had before them *contenti estote* (*Veronens. Brix.*), or *sufficientes estote* (*Vercellens.*).

The translator confounded the word *πεπλήρωκεν*, in John 16: 6, with *πεπώρωκεν*, so that **GADAUBIDA**, *hath deprived of sense*, is used instead of **GAFULLIDA**, *hath filled*. This mistake has been remarked before; as well as that in Luke 8: 25, where for *τροφή* the word *τροφή*, **FUDEINS**, *food, victuals*, is used.

In John 7: 12, *ἀληθής* is substituted for *ἀγάθος*, which was very easy in Greek; but in *Cod. Brix. Argent.*, likewise, which resembles this one very much, the same substitution occurs, the translation being *verax est*. It would be difficult, therefore, to determine which of the two originally made the mistake, and which borrowed it from the other.

A similar case occurs in Matt. 8: 9, where the translator, by inaccurate punctuation, joined *ἔχων* to *ἐξουσίαν*, and then, to make sense, changed or mistook *ὑπ' ἐμαυτὸν* for *τὴν ἐμαυτοῦ*. He thus obtained the following clause: *ἐγὼ ἀνθρώπος εἰμι ὑπὸ ἐξουσίαν ἔχων τὴν ἐμαυτοῦ στρατιώτας*. A circumstance of this kind could have originated only from a direct inspection of the Greek. But *Cod. Brix.* gives precisely the same turn to the sentence: *et ego homo sum habens sub potestatem meam milites*. Now who can decide which of the two translators first misinterpreted the original, and which took his translation from the other?

I conjecture that two words are confounded in another place. Though the case is not exactly pertinent, I will indulge myself in a word or two

upon it, as it gives me an opportunity to present an amendment of the Gothic text. In Matt. 27: 48, *δραμών* is strangely translated *bearing*. *Φερών* and *δραμών* could hardly be mistaken for each other; the mistake must therefore be elsewhere, viz. in the Gothic. The words *SUNSƿRAƿIDA* and *SUNSSIIRAƿIDA*,—*sunsthragida*, *he bore quickly*—*sunssprangida*, *he ran quickly*,—were erroneously confounded with each other.

In Luke 1: 10, *προσδεχόμενον*, BEIDANDANS, (still retained in the Suabian dialect in the word *beithen*, *to wait for*, *to expect*,) is substituted for *προσευχόμενον*. In Luke 14: 14, the translator read *αυτοὶ οὐκ ἔχουσιν* instead of *ὅτι οὐκ ἔχουσιν*. In Luke 15: 16, for *κεραίων* is put HAURNE, *κεράτων*; for *κέρας* is translated HAURN in Luke 1: 69, and we find in Matt. 9: 23, HAURNIANDANS, *blower of a horn*. In Luke 19: 25, *μνᾶς* was taken for an abbreviation of *μερίδας*, and translated DAILOS, *parts*. In Rom. 11: 33, the translator read, for *ἀνεξερεύνητα*, the word *ἀνεξέρετα*, a compound hardly to be met with in any good author; yet he has rendered it syllable for syllable, UN-US-SPILODA, *not ἄ ὁ ῥ ῆ τ α*.

Lastly, in Luke 9: 18, *συνῆσαν αὐτῷ* is rendered GAMOTIDEDUN IMMA, which Edward Lye translated by the Swedish *mötte hom*, and the English *met him*. There is no doubt that GAMOTJAN (Luke 14: 31. Mark 14: 13,) signifies *to meet*. Hence *συνῆσαν* must have been mistaken for *συνῆντησαν*.

## § 140.

It is clear, therefore, that the version was made from a Greek MS., and, as we shall see, from one belonging to the Constantinopolitan Recension. We will exhibit proofs of this from the eleventh chapter of Mark.

Lucian.		Hesychius.	
2. οὐδεὶς ἀνθρώπων		οὐδεὶς οὐπω ἀνθρώπων	
λύσαντες αὐτὸν ἀγάγετε	G.	λύσατε αὐτὸν καὶ φέρετε	
3. αὐτὸν ἀποστέλλει ὥδε	G.	ἀποστέλλει πάλιν αὐτόν	
6. ἐντείλατο	G.	εἶπεν	
7. ἐνέβαλον ἐπ' αὐτῷ.	G.	ἐπιβάλλουσιν ἐπ' αὐτόν	
9. ἔκραζον λέγοντες	G.	ἔκραζον	
10. βασιλεία ἐν ὀνόματι κυρίου	G.	βασιλεία	
11. εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα ὃ Ἰησοῦς	G.	εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα	
13. μακρόθεν	G.	ἀπὸ μακρόθεν	
εὐρήσει τί	G.	τί εὐρήσει	
14. ἐκ σοῦ εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα	G.	εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα ἐκ σοῦ	
15. εἰσελθὼν ὃ Ἰησοῦς	G.	εἰσελθὼν	
18. γραμματεῖς καὶ οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς	G.	ἀρχιερεῖς καὶ οἱ γραμματεῖς	
23. αὐτῷ ὃ ἐὰν εἴπῃ	G.	αὐτῷ	
24. λαμβάνετε	G.	ἐλάβετε	
26. *)			
28. καὶ λέγουσιν		καὶ ἔλεγον	G.
τὴν ἔξουσ. ταύτ. ἔδωκεν	G.	ἔδωκε τὴν ἔξουσ. ταύτ.	
29. ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν	G.	εἶπεν	
32. ὅτι ὄντως προφήτης	G.	ὄντως ὅτι προφήτης	
33. λέγουσι τῷ Ἰησοῦ		τῷ Ἰησοῦ λέγουσιν.	

There are two peculiar readings in this chapter found only in the Gothic text; viz., in v. 10, after ἐν ὀνόματι, the word κυρίου is omitted (probably because the following τοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν Δαβὶδ did not seem to the translator consistent with κυρίου); and in v. 33, λέγ. αὐτῷ is read instead of λέγ. τῷ Ἰησοῦ.

The 26th verse, which is wanting in many Egyptian MSS. (and probably in the Recension generally, though I will not positively assert this,) existed in the Gothic text, as in all Constantinopolitan MSS.

In two readings, however, this version follows neither the Lucianian nor Hesychian Recension, but adheres to the third. In the 2d verse it reads οὐδεὶς πώποτε ἀνθρώπων; not οὕτω, as Lye asserts, for NAUH is πῶ or πώποτε—οὐδέπω or οὕτω is NINAUH. This reading it has in common with *Cod. Argent.* In v. 8., where the Constantinopolitan and Egyptian Recensions agree in the reading εἰς τὴν ὁδόν, it has, not IN VIG, but ANA VIGA, ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ, which is found in A, K, M, 11, 114, 116. In other readings, however, it deviates so far from the MSS. of the third Recension, that these two instances are only exceptions from the general fact.

It was not the lot of this document, however, to continue long without additions; for the Latin versions previous to Jerome's time, with which the Goths in Italy became acquainted, furnished various materials, for (as it was supposed) embellishing the MSS. of this version with many additions. This was the more likely to be done, as sometimes one of these Latin versions was written by the side of the Gothic, of which convincing evidence is afforded by the fragments of the Epistle to the Romans. Alterations were made in order that they might harmonise where as yet they did not, and probably often only for the sake of making the lines and verses of each correspond.

When they were not written opposite each other, collation frequently gave rise to marginal notes, which were afterwards inserted in the text. Ihre, in the preface to his "*Ulfilas illustratus*," enumerates fourteen marginal notes in the *Codex Argenteus*, ready for incorporation with the text as amendments in the next transcript of it which should be made. E. g. at Luke 9: 34, ἐν τῷ ἐκείνους εἰσελθεῖν εἰς τὴν νεφέλην, where the translator confined himself closely to the Greek phraseology, some one has placed the Latin reading at the side, AIH AT IM IN MILH-MAM ATGAGGANDAM, like *Cod. Veronens.* and *Brixiens.*, "*et intrantibus illis in nubem.*" Junius even adopted the last reading in the text of his edition.

It was in this way that a version intended to represent the Constantinopolitan Recension with extreme fidelity, and to render it word for word, became of so heterogeneous a character. From the Latin, e. g., comes the long addition after πᾶσιν οἷς ἐποίει in Luke 9: 43, which appears as follows in the MS. of Brescia: *Dixit Petrus, Domine, quare nos non potuimus ejicere eum? at ille dixit, hoc genus non exiet, nisi in orationibus et jejuniis.*—So in v. 50, after ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν εἶσιν, where the Latin MSS. read: *Nemo est enim, qui non faciat virtutem in nomine meo, et poterit male loqui de me*, the Gothic text contains the first part of the Latin reading as far as *et poterit*, with a small variation: *Nec ullus enim est hominum, qui non*, etc. But it is too well known what this version has suffered from the acquaintance which its readers had with the

ancient Latin text, to make it necessary for me to present further proofs or examples.

Yet the difficulty which this creates in criticism is not great. The origin of the Gothic version would lead us to expect that it should certify what was formerly genuine and usual in the Constantinopolitan Recension. On this point it is certainly a venerable and authoritative witness, and, in order to obtain its evidence pure, it is merely necessary that what has been added to it from the Latin should be carefully distinguished and separated. This is in general so easily perceptible, and can so readily be removed by collation, that there is very little danger of error.

As to the Epistles, the passages selected as specimens by Maio are not very well suited to show what Recension the version exhibits, because many of the discrepancies between different Recensions are not perceptible in versions; and this is the case in the specimens which are published, more than in the other chapters of the Pauline Epistles.

### § 141.

The procedure of the translator evinces that he was a man of ability, sound judgment and capacity. He does not give a merely general expression of the meaning of the text, nor content himself with a paraphrase of it, without reference to each particular word and minute part of speech; but he confines himself strictly to his text, and adjusts his language to it by means of well-chosen phraseology and happy compounds, without doing violence to the language or sacrificing its laws to an obscure literalism. We see that he was sometimes at a loss as to the Greek; but over his own language he had complete mastery. It was, in fact, no light thing to undertake a work of this kind, in a dialect, the laws of which had not been investigated and had not been enumerated, discussed, or classified by any grammarian, and, notwithstanding, to execute it with as much consistency and uniformity in the management of the language, as if he was provided with a regular grammar of its principles.

He seems to have added punctuation-marks himself, to assist his countrymen in reading and understanding his version; for they are found in the Upsal and Ambrosian copies, and are alike in all. At the end of a sentence a dot is placed, and two dots at the end of a series of sentences or a paragraph.

The Epistle to the Hebrews is wanting in both of the Milan MSS.; and perhaps not accidentally, as is confidently asserted. This, however, need not surprise us, for it was not acknowledged by the friends of the Arian creed generally. (Comp. the II<sup>d</sup> Part of this *Intro.* § 147.)



THE SCLAVONIC VERSION.

§ 142.

In the beginning of the 9th century, the archbishops of Lorch, in what is now Austria above the Ens, attempted to extend and establish Christianity in Moravia. Their attempts succeeded. Many of the principal men of the kingdom, and among them Duke Moymir, attached themselves to the missionaries and were baptized.

But the quarrels between Louis, king of Germany, and Rastislav, Duke of Moravia, stopped the progress of the German priests in the latter country. When Rastislav heard of the success with which Constantine, surnamed the Philosopher, preached Christianity among the Chazars, on the northern shore of the Black Sea, he determined to get finally rid of the German missionaries, and requested the court at Constantinople to permit this Constantine, who was afterwards called Cyril, to teach his subjects. He came, accompanied by his brother Methodius, and entered on his new duties. Hitherto Latin MSS. had been used in the religious worship of the Moravians. Constantine and his brother clearly perceived how much influence they would acquire over the people by instituting public religious service in the national language. They therefore made use of the alphabet which they had invented for the Bulgarians, and prepared a Slavonic version of the Psalter, the New Testament, and the liturgical books. The result justified their undertaking; but it was regarded unfavorably at Rome. No absolute prohibition, however, of their judicious scheme was issued; a middle course was proposed.

§ 143.

The Slavonic version, then, was made in the middle of the ninth century by two native Greeks, and, as would be expected, from Greek MSS. They were born and brought up under the Constantinopolitan patriarchate, and were sent from Constantinople itself into the new harvest. We may hence infer the character of the MSS. they carried with them, and what text is followed by the version.

And it certainly exhibits, in general, the text of that family of MSS. which we have denominated the Constantinopolitan or Lucian Recension. We will select but a single chapter of the Gospels in proof of this. All the readings here presented from Lucian's Recension are exhibited in the Slavonic version, as we know from Prof. Alter's collation of two MSS. in the Royal Library at Vienna, viz. *Cod. Slav.* No. CCCLV, and No. CCCLVI.

## Mark V.

## Lucian.

2. καὶ ἐξελθόντι αὐτῷ  
 3. ἀλύσεισιν οὐδεὶς  
 9. σοὶ ὄνομα  
 ἀπεκρίθη λέγων  
 12. καὶ παρεκάλεσαν αὐτὸν πάντες  
 οἱ δαίμονες λέγ . . . . .  
 13. αὐτοῖς εὐθέως  
 ὁ Ἰησοῦς καὶ ἐξελθ . . . .  
 14. οἱ δὲ βόσκ . . . . .  
 τοὺς χοίρους  
 καὶ ἐξῆλθον  
 15. καθήμ . . . καὶ ἱματισ . . .  
 18. ἵνα ἢ μετ' αὐτοῦ  
 19. ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς οὐκ ἀφῆκ . . .  
 22. καὶ ἰδοὺ ἔρχ . . . .  
 23. καὶ ζήσεται  
 25. καὶ γυνή τις  
 33. γέγονεν ἐπ' αὐτῇ  
 38. καὶ ἔρχεται  
 40. ὁ δὲ ἐκβαλ . . . .  
 τὸ παιδίον ἀνακείμενον

## Hesychius.

- καὶ ἐξελθόντος αὐτοῦ  
 ἀλύσει οὐκέτι οὐδεὶς  
 ὄνομά σοι  
 λέγει αὐτῷ  
 καὶ παρεκάλεσαν αὐτόν  
 λέγ . . . .  
 αὐτοῖς  
 καὶ ἐξελθ . . . .  
 καὶ οἱ βόσκ . . .  
 αὐτούς  
 καὶ ἦλθον  
 καθήμ . . . ἱματισ . . . .  
 ἵνα μετ' αὐτοῦ ἢ  
 καὶ οὐκ ἀφῆκ . . . . .  
 καὶ ἔρχ . . .  
 καὶ ζήσῃ  
 καὶ γυνή  
 γέγονεν αὐτῇ  
 καὶ ἔρχονται  
 αὐτὸς δὲ ἐκβαλ . . .  
 τὸ παιδίον

One of the students and friends of Slavonic literature has asserted, judging rather, it would seem, from a few engraved readings than from the general character of this version, that it agrees remarkably with Codex L and D.<sup>1</sup>

It is true that it has frequently the same readings, because the MSS. of one Recension were interpolated from another; but I apprehend that very few of them owe their origin to interpolations from Greek MSS. At any rate, it frequently happens that such readings as it has in common with L and D, occur likewise in the Vulgate and in the Latin fathers. E. g. Matt. 10: 12, τὴν οἰκίαν λέγοντες, εἰρήνη τῷ οἴκῳ τούτῳ, DL. Vulg.—12: 15, πάντας δὲ, οὓς ἐθεράπευσεν, ἐπέληξεν, D. Slav. 2. Vulg.—17: 2, λευκὰ ὡς ὁ χιὼν, D. Slav. Vulg.—Mark 11: 15, καὶ πάλιν ἔρχονται, L. Vulg.—11: 24, ὅτι λήψεσθε, D. Vulg.—14: 41, ἀναπαύεσθε τὸ τέλος, D. Latt.—15: 16, ἔσω εἰς τὴν ἀλλήν, D. Latt.—Luke 2: 23, ὁ πατὴρ αὐτοῦ καὶ ἡ μήτηρ αὐτοῦ, BDL. Slav. 1. Vulg.—11: 14, δαιμονίου ἐκβληθέντος, AL. Vulg. &c.

## § 144.

Interpolation from the Latin is possible and supposable, if the regulation of John VIII respecting the use of the Slavonic language in the church service ever went into effect.<sup>2</sup> Yet, granting this, it did not

<sup>1</sup> Dobrowsky in Michaelis' "Neuer oriental. exegetischer Biblioth." T. VII. p. 155—167.

<sup>2</sup> Baron. ad ann. 880. "Jubemus tamen," writes John VIII to Duke Swatopluk, "ut in omnibus ecclesiis terræ vestræ propter majorem honorificentiam Evangelium Latine legatur, ut postmodum Slavonicâ linguâ translaturum in auribus populi Latina verba non intelligentis annuncietur, sicut in quibusdam ecclesiis fieri videtur." No. XIX.

long continue in force; for Wratisslaw, Duke of Bohemia, requested Gregory VII to permit the use of the Slavonic version among his subjects in religious worship. Gregory refused, on the following ground in particular: *non immerito sacram scripturam omnipotenti Deo placuisse quibusdam in locis esse occultam, ne, si ad liquidum cunctis pateret, forte vilesceret et subjaceret despectui, aut prave intellecta a mediocribus, in errorem induceret.*" (*Greg. Ep. L. VII. Ep. 15 a. 1080.*) The Slavonic ritual, therefore, had been sometime out of use: it was probably dropped between the years 935 and 970, when the bishopric of Moravia and that of Regensburg were united.<sup>1</sup> I therefore readily restrict my assertion that the Latin version had an important influence on the readings of the Slavonic, particularly as appearances may be explained by the condition of the Greek copy from which the latter was made.

One Recension was sometimes interpolated from the others, and thus, clearly, readings from the *κοινή ἐκδοσις* and from Egyptian MSS. may have been introduced into Constantine's copies.<sup>2</sup>

### § 145.

Although this version lays no claim to high antiquity, it is yet a valuable document, exceedingly worthy of critical pains. The *editio princeps* of the Gospels is a quarto edition of 1512, which appeared in Wallachia; next comes the Gospels published at Wilna, 1575, then the whole bible at Ostrog, 1581, and a reprint at Moscow, 1663.

## CHAPTER IX.

### PRINCIPLES OF CRITICISM.

### § 146.

A sketch of the history of the text of the New Testament has been presented, and the means which offer their aid in obviating the inaccuracies with which it has become disfigured have been enumerated and discussed in their order. We have now to seek for the principles by which our procedure in the execution of this task is to be directed. These we shall most surely arrive at by considering the accidents to which the text has been exposed, and in what way the various errors in it originated. History is here, as generally when practical rules of conduct are in question, our instructress.

The more the history of the text has been developed, the greater simplicity and precision have the operations of criticism obtained. We are

<sup>1</sup> Assemani, "Kalendaria ecclesiæ universæ." T. IV. P. II. c. 3. §. 24. p. 202—5.

<sup>2</sup> I willingly yield this deference to Dobrowsky, who (in *Slavanka*, a periodical work on Slavonic literature, 2d number, Prag. 1815,) defends the Slavonic version against the imputation of interpolation from the Latin, which, in the first edition of this work, I asserted more confidently than I ought.

now aware, that in critical decisions all depends on a few voices only, which are to be compared, examined, and weighed. Criticism has ceased to be an interminable task, in which there is no end to the inquiry for various readings, in which in every particular case it is necessary to refer to some hundred MSS., and to give each of them its weight. It has ceased to be the case that a scholar, irresolute which of the multitude he should follow, can, according to his taste, or his preference for a particular MS., or a liking for some peculiarity, some new various reading in a particular Codex, or other grounds not at all better, select and form a text which may be destroyed by the next editor, who does it only to see the same right exercised upon him by his successor. We now know the deficiencies in our critical apparatus; we perceive a limit to our labors, a definite purpose in the collection of readings, and a rule by which we may decide respecting them.

Our documents are now divided into certain classes, under which each individual document which we already possess and are acquainted with, or which we may hereafter obtain, (unless a new class should make its appearance,) may be comprised. All MSS. which cannot be included under any one of these, having been produced by strange mixtures of different texts, can come into consideration only so far as they throw light upon the history of the various accidents to which the text was exposed. We have a text termed the *κοινὴ ἔκδοσις*, the Gospels of which are exhibited in Codex D, the MSS. of Thomas of Charkel, and I, 13, 19, 124; the Acts of the Apostles, in DE, and Thomas' MSS.; the Epistles, in DEFG; and the whole in the old Syriac version, the Latin versions antecedent to Jerome, and the Upper Egyptian or Thebaic version.

We have a text amended by Hesychius, the Gospels of which are preserved in the MSS. BCL and some others; the Acts and Catholic Epistles in ABC, 40, *Vat.* 367. Matthæi I.; the Pauline Epistles in ABC, 17, 46; the Apocalypse in AC, *Vat.* 579 and 26. *Vindob. Kollar.* We have the whole in the Lower-Egyptian or Memphitic version, and the Pauline and Catholic Epistles in the Ethiopic.

We have an amended text by Lucian, of which the Gospels are contained in the MSS. EFGHSV and b, h.; the Acts in the Moscow MSS. f, a1, b, d, c, m, k, in *Alex.-Vat.* 29. and *Lambec.* XXXVIII. XXXV.; the Pauline and Catholic Epistles in the Moscow MS. g, and in k, l, m, c, d, a3, b, in *Alex.-Vat.* 29. *Pio-Vat.* 50., and *Lambec.* XXVIII. XXXVII. XXXV. I.; the Apocalypse in r, k, p, l, and o, *Harlei.* 5613. or *Griesb.* 29. *Lamb.* I. *Alex.-Vat.* 68. *Vat.* 116. *Pio-Vat.* 50. We have the Gospels in the Gothic version; the Acts and Epistles in the Arabic version of the Polyglots; the whole New Testament in the Sclavonic version.

Lastly, we have also a text of the Gospels revised by Origen in A, K, M, 42, 114, 116, Matth. 10. and the Philoxenian version. A more exact knowledge of this version will disclose in what MSS. the other parts of the New Testament are contained.



## § 147.

The *κοινή ἔκδοσις*, as we have shown, exhibits the ancient text, but with many alterations, which it underwent during the 2d and a part of the 3d century. These alterations were the attempts of private individuals to illustrate the Bible, and as such did not pass into all MSS., but differed in MSS. as readers, times, and places differed. Now these passages in which such alterations took place are arbitrary disfigurements of the general text. In order to possess the true text we must obtain the most ancient, in which no such alterations had yet taken place. All will agree to this; and consequently we assume it as a principle, that

*That text is the true text which was read in all MSS. without exception in the most ancient times.*

To discover this, however, we ought to have a very great number of MSS. of the *κοινή ἔκδοσις* of various countries and periods, so as to determine from comparison what are merely temporary and local additions to the text. Now as this is not the case, it might be thought that, though this principle be valid, we must despair of obtaining by its aid the ancient unanimous text. So it would appear; but, in preparing each recension, its author must have collected a great number of the MSS. of his country for the purpose of adopting or rejecting according to their agreement or disagreement. Each Recension, therefore, represents a collection of MSS. of the *κοινή ἔκδοσις*, as far as in any particular country they harmonised in one text; and we hence derive a second principle.

*The MSS. of the κοινή ἔκδοσις and the Recensions of different countries afford us together, the means of determining the most ancient and universal text.*

## § 148.

Neither of the Recensions, however, has come down to us through its MSS. in a state of purity. All of them in process of time were subjected to repeated accidents. We must, therefore, first of all discover what each of them did or did not read, and what each of them actually testifies in favor of; i. e. we must first restore the purity of the Recensions. To do this we must make use of our former principle, viz. that,

*That which the MSS. of a Recension unanimously exhibit, is the peculiar reading of that Recension.*

(a) Where MSS. differ, however, the oldest deserve the preference over the more modern; as they have not so often passed through the hands of copyists, who were in the habit of introducing into the text the annotations in the margin and between the lines, and indulging themselves, likewise, in criticisms of their own.

(b) As it respects more modern MSS., those are to be preferred to others of their own age, or are to be considered next in rank to the oldest, which are not disfigured by numerous peculiarities, contain the fewest *lectiones singulares*, have suffered least from additions and correc-

tions, and betray the least negligence—in short, the less they differ from their class generally.

(c) Where we have both the ancient MS. and the more modern transcript of it, they are to be regarded as one MS. and not as two.

(d) In respect to versions of which we possess good critical editions, the older they are, the nearer they approach the period when the Recensions which they represent came from the hand of the emendator, and they are therefore more decisive than a MS. Generally, too, the translator made use of more than one of the MSS. of his country.

(e) The same is the case also in respect to the earlier fathers, when we are certain what they really read.

When these old and long established rules are not sufficiently decisive, they may be supported or their deficiencies supplied by internal marks. The critics to whom we owe the Recensions (particularly Hesychius,) gave the preference in their choice of readings to the most grammatical expression or the purest Greek phraseology. (§ 37.) The following principles result from this characteristic of their critical procedure.

(a) That reading is the genuine reading of the Recension, which accords best with the laws of the Greek language, or is most elegant.

(b) The Recensions took their rise from the *κοινὴ ἔκδοσις* of their country; so that when there are various readings, that is most probable which agrees most with the *κοινὴ ἔκδοσις*.

(c) Here, however, another historical fact must be taken into consideration. Revised MSS. were subsequently interpolated anew from MSS. of the *κοινὴ ἔκδοσις*. (§ 40.) Now if there is any probability that the agreement arises from this circumstance—if, e.g., the reading of the *κοινὴ ἔκδοσις* appears only in modern MSS., while in others it is inserted in the margin or between the lines, or placed over the earlier readings as a correction—if such signs of a later interpolation are visible, we must follow precisely the opposite principle from the preceding.

(d) That reading of one Recension is to be preferred which agrees least with another Recension. For the Recensions were in later times frequently interpolated from each other by copyists and readers who collated different MSS. (§ 37.)

(e) In case of difference in MSS., we shall readily observe whether the beginning or end of church-lessons, the critical observations of the fathers or of commentators have had any influence in respect to that difference; in which case the suspicious part must give way to that to which no suspicion is attached.

(f) My observation has led me to believe that Hesychius usually favored the shortest readings; Lucian the longest. (§ 38. 111. 139. 143.)

### § 149.

When we have discovered what is the true reading of each Recension, it becomes the business of criticism to weigh these three voices or Recensions and the existing MSS. of the *κοινὴ ἔκδοσις* against each other, in case they do not agree.

Every Recension is, in truth, a collection of several MSS. of the *κοινὴ ἔκδοσις*, with this difference, that the judgment of its author

has already discarded or adopted what appeared to him on collating the MSS. worthy of rejection or approval; often, however, as his taste and inclination dictated. This last was particularly the case in respect to their preference of the reading which was pure and elegant as to Greek construction, and especially in their avoiding, when they could, all Hebrew phrases and turns of expression.

I. When, therefore, the MSS. of the *κοινή ἔκδοσις* still extant agree in a harsh and rude expression, their agreement in it is of more weight than the agreement of the Recensions in one more strictly grammatical and elegant.

II. As not only the authors of the Recension, but also the readers of the *κοινή ἔκδοσις*, earnestly strove to get rid of the Hebraisms—when a Hebraistic reading is still preserved in a MS. of the *κοινή ἔκδοσις*, it is to be considered as a genuine constituent part of the text in spite of the opposing voice of the Recensions.

III. It is also a universally admitted principle, that we should incline to that reading which is encompassed by exegetical difficulties. For all correctors labored to elucidate or get rid of such readings, and corrections were always made, not to render passages more difficult, but more plain. Yet there must be such an agreement in the MSS. of the *κοινή ἔκδοσις* in regard to a reading of this kind, as to leave no room for supposing that the difficulty originated in the blundering awkwardness of the copyist.

These are the cases in which the testimony of the *κοινή ἔκδοσις* outweighs the authority of all the Recensions; for the authors of the latter, in these cases, did not follow so much the evidence of the best copies they could obtain, as their own private judgment.

#### § 150.

IV. But in general the Recensions maintain a far higher authority than the existing MSS. of the *κοινή ἔκδοσις*. For each of them arose from, and is the result of, the collation of several such MSS. Hence any reading in which they all agree is a reading universally attested in various countries and copies.

V. But if the Recensions differ, we can hardly allow a preeminence to one over another; for we do not know respecting either that its author consulted more, older, or better copies than the rest. If we were to grant precedence to either of them, it would be Origen's; inasmuch as its author had the most experience in the business of criticism, was able to procure more MSS. than the others, and was likewise more cautious and prudent in his procedure than any other ancient critic. But it is very seldom that we can apply such a precedence to any practical use. Two Recensions frequently contradict the other, and,

VI. When this happens, the majority of voices is to decide. For, inasmuch as, in preparing the text, each author of a Recension consulted several MSS. in his own province, the agreement of two Recensions against the other is to be relied upon the more securely, as the MSS. of two different provinces could hardly have been subjected to the same corruptions, in such a manner that they would be found in the greater number of the MSS. used.

VII. In some instances, however, each of the three Recensions has a different reading. The reason of this difference lies either in the fact that the authors favored that reading which was least Hebraistic, most grammatical or elegant, (here come in the principles laid down in the preceding §); or in the fact that in the ancient copies which they followed, certain mistakes had become so universal that the critics were induced to adopt them as genuine readings.

(a) Now the ancient copies were corrupted, (not to speak of what was introduced into them from harmonies and apocryphal books,) by the interpolation of passages and expressions from another writer, or from some parallel passage, and further, where the Old Testament is referred to in the New, by the adoption of some expression or clause from the former. (§. 24. N. 3. §. 31. N. 3.)

(b) The formulæ at the beginning and end of church-lessons were inserted in the text itself. (§. 24. N. 1. §. 31. N. 6.)

(c) A change was made in the order of the words in order the better to connect them with such introductory or concluding formulæ, or, generally, to connect more closely clauses which seemed too far separated from each other. (§. 33. N. 6.)

(d) Some passages are given in a paraphrastic form. (§. 33. N. 4.)

When a mistake of this description, or a similar one, (several of which we have enumerated in the history of the *κοινή ἔκδοσις*), is found in any Recension, its authority is no longer to be regarded in settling the true reading.

VIII. It may be the case, when in a particular passage the three Recensions differ, that two of them approach each other, and differ only in unimportant points; in which case their agreement in the main brings us pretty near the true reading.

IX. When Recensions differ, it may happen that the MSS. of the *κοινή ἔκδοσις* concur with one of them and give it a preponderance over the others. Or the unrevised text may afford us hints from which we can infer the origin of the readings in the Recensions, and can judge from that origin what estimation they deserve.

X. These rules respect additions or alterations in the text; and we have not as yet considered at all a third species of variations, viz. omissions. As to these, it is a generally admitted rule that, where one clause ends in a similar manner as the following, i. e. with the same expression or like phraseology, what is wanting shall be restored to the text, since it was left out only on account of the Homoioteleuton.

XI. Omissions were made intentionally, however, when synonymous expressions followed one another in such a way that one of them was regarded by the critic as an addition, and was rejected accordingly. (§. 24. N. 7.)

XII. Or, which is nearly the same thing, when tautological expressions or clauses occurred, as was not unusual with the Hebrews, one of them was removed from the text as an explanatory addition. (§. 24. N. 8.)

When Recensions differ, if either of these causes has occasioned the omission of an expression or passage in one Recension, such omission is to be supplied from the others.



## § 151.

In the use, however, and estimation of these means of criticism, we must be guided principally by a minute study of each writer, his style, his favorite expressions and phrases, his custom as to the use of connecting words, his grammatical peculiarities, &c. It is not till we have become intimately acquainted with the character of each in these respects, that we can pronounce what readings belong to him; which we should choose, and which reject.

We are inclined to attribute something in this business to critical sensibility or feeling. I admit that in works of art and of taste this frequently guides us happily, even when it is not possible to explain it intelligibly. But so long as we stop with this, our judgment is merely conjecture. To the connoisseur this suffices but for a moment, until he has received the impression; he then analyzes his sensations, searches for their causes in the object, and satisfies himself that his sensations are correct and why they are produced. Much more should this be the case in respect to writings which are rather anomalies than works of art.



# INTRODUCTION

TO THE

SCRIPTURES OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.

## PART II.

### CHAP. I.

THE HISTORICAL BOOKS OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.

#### § 1.

We find in ancient Mss. a twofold order, in which the Gospels are arranged. They stand either thus: Matthew, John, Luke, Mark; or thus: Matthew, Mark, Luke, John. The first arrangement is made with reference to the character and rank of the persons; the Apostles taking precedence of their assistants and attendants (*ἀκολουθοίς, comitibus*). It is observed in the most ancient Latin versions,<sup>1</sup> and in the Gothic; sometimes, also, in the works of Latin fathers;<sup>2</sup> and in one only of all the Greek Mss., viz. that at Cambridge.

The other order, viz. Matthew, Mark, Luke, John, is the common and established one in all the ancient versions of Asia and Africa, in all catalogues of the canonical books, and in Greek Mss. generally. Paying no regard to personal relations, it follows the order of time, and is a plain indication what accounts in regard to the succession of the Evangelists were current among the Asiatic, Greek, and African churches, at the time when the Christian Scriptures were collected and arranged.<sup>3</sup>

The same statement, although in a mutilated form, is still extant in

<sup>1</sup> Codd. Brix., Veronens., Vercellens. and, in part, Vindobonens.

<sup>2</sup> Tertullian. L. IV. Adv. Marcion c. 2. "Denique nobis fidem ex apostolis Johannes et Matthæus insinuant, ex apostolicis Lucas et Marcus instaurant."

<sup>3</sup> Luke's Acts of the Apostles is his *δεύτερος λόγος*, the second part of his Gospel. (See below § 71.) The two books, therefore, as belonging together, should have been united. This might easily have been done, if it had been thought proper to assign Luke's Gospel a place after John's. But it was considered best violently to separate the two part, rather than permit the succession of the Evangelists to take an order at variance with history.

Epiphanius,<sup>1</sup> and in the Church History and Chronicon of Eusebius.<sup>2</sup> Eusebius concurs in the main, if not in every particular, with the Cyprian bishop. It can therefore make no difference which of the two accounts we examine; but we will give the preference to the father of Church History. After quoting for some time statements of other persons respecting John, he says in his own words: Let us now specify his undisputed writings. Here we must first of all mention his Gospel, which is acknowledged by all the churches under heaven; and that it certainly was properly placed by the ancients, in the fourth place, after the other three, is evident from what follows . . . . Matthew, who taught at first among the Jews, published his Gospel in his native language, when he went to visit other nations, in order, by written instruction, to make amends to those whom he left for his absence.<sup>3</sup> When Mark and Luke had published their Gospels . . . . and these three had fallen into the hands of many persons, and among the rest into his own, he accorded them his approbation and his testimony to their accuracy; . . . . only there were some deficiencies in them . . . . on which account John, it is said, by request, treated in his Gospel of the period which had been omitted by the rest and the actions of our Saviour which were included in it."

Long before these two writers, however, a learned biblical critic, Origen, had declared that Matthew was the oldest historical Christian writer; Mark the second; Luke the third; and John the last of the four.<sup>4</sup>

Still further back, in the second century, Irenæus represents this same chronological succession of the Evangelists as a matter about which there was no uncertainty or difference of opinion.<sup>5</sup>

The Latins, although they did not adopt the chronological order in their copies, assigning the first rank to the Apostles and the next to their disciples, were not ignorant of the order of time in which they succeeded each other. Jerome constantly asserts that Matthew wrote first, then Mark, then Luke, and last of all, John. The same is stated by Augustine.<sup>6</sup>

The account contained in the celebrated fragment in Muratori mounts up more than a century above the days of these two fathers. According to this, Luke was third in the order of time in publishing his Gospel, and the beloved disciple last. Accident has destroyed the account as to the two first.<sup>7</sup>

Whatever degree of discrepancy there may be between the costumes with which the fact is clothed by different writers, and however various

<sup>1</sup> Epiphanius. Hær. LI. from the words: ἡ γὰρ πᾶσα τῶν εὐαγγελίων ὑπόθεσις οὕτως ἔχει. . . . .

<sup>2</sup> Euseb. H. E. L. III. c. 24.

<sup>3</sup> It should perhaps be read: ἀφ' ὧν διεστέλλετο.

<sup>4</sup> Euseb. H. E. VI. 25. Comp., also, Origen's Homil. VII. in Josuam. T. II. Opp. Ruel. p. 412. "Sacredotali tuba primus in evangelio suo Matthæus increpuit Marcus quoque, etc." Comment. in Jo. T. VI. p. 132. Opp. Vol. IV. Ἀρξάμενος ἀπὸ τοῦ Ματθαίου, ὃς καὶ παραδεδὼτας πρῶτος τῶν λοιπῶν τοῖς Ἑβραίοις ἐκδεδωκέναι τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τοῖς ἐκ περιτομῆς πιστεύουσι.

<sup>5</sup> Iren. L. III. Adv. Hær. c. 1. Euseb. H. E. V. 8.

<sup>6</sup> Augustin. De consensu Evangelist. L. I. §. 3.

<sup>7</sup> Antiqq. Ital. Medii ævi. T. III. p. 854.



may be the sources from which they derived it, they all agree in respect to this chronological relation of the Evangelists, and are unanimous in assuring us that this was the real order of succession.

One only must be excepted, viz. Clement of Alexandria, who asserts, that those Gospels which contain the genealogies were written first.<sup>1</sup> This allegation does not, indeed, call in question the priority of Matthew, but it assigns to Mark only the third place among the Evangelists. He also refers expressly to his authority for this statement, against which I can only say that Origen, his pupil, and the fathers generally after him, considered the authorities which they followed to be so unquestionable that not one of them concurred with the opinion of Clement; and, moreover, that the historian by whom we have been apprised of this opinion, did not in consequence of it waver in his own belief a moment. We may hence infer the confidence and certainty which the ancients felt in regard to the succession of the Evangelists; all being agreed respecting it but Clement.

At the lowest estimate, these declarations of the ancient Christians must be regarded as making this order very probable, and requiring us to proceed in our investigations accordingly, hoping they will be confirmed, but determined to reject them if they involve us in difficulties of importance or lead us to absurd conclusions.

## § 2.

Of the four biographies of Jesus extant, that of Matthew is declared by history to be the oldest. She is, however, so contradictory in her testimony as to the precise time at which it was composed, and as to certain other points in regard to it, that we can expect no satisfactory information from her, but must refer the whole inquiry to the province of higher criticism. The inferences which we can draw as to the immediate purposes of the writer from his mode of procedure, and as to the time at which he wrote from the circumstances, which surrounded him, are in this case more to be relied on than either of the various accounts of antiquity.

The scene of the events related is Judea; the persons introduced are mostly natives of that country; the circle of thought, the religious and civil circumstances are Jewish, and very different from those of most of the nations of that period.

Mark, who, like Matthew, wrote the life of Jesus, frequently finds it necessary, from regard to those whom he expected to be his readers, to explain certain peculiarities in Jewish customs and opinions. The Pharisees, he relates, complained that the disciples of Jesus ate *κοιναῖς χερσίν*, i. e. literally, *with common hands*. Supposing that his readers might not be acquainted with the Jewish signification of this expression, he subjoins the explanation: that is to say, with unwashed hands, *τοῦτ ἔστιν ἀνίτοις*. Still apprehending that they might not thoroughly comprehend the ground of this complaint and the reply made to it, he explains the occurrence by an observation on the customs and opinions

<sup>1</sup> Προγεγράφθαι ἐλέγετο τῶν εὐαγγελίων τὰ περιέχοντα τὰς γενεαλογίας. Euseb. H. E. VI. 14.

of the Pharisees, stating that they never eat without washing their hands and would think themselves, in case they were to do so, defiled. He explains what the *παράσκευή* meant among the Jews, by saying, i. e. *the day before the sabbath*, τοῦτ' ἔστι προσάββατον; and likewise what was meant by *κορβάν*, as Josephus did for his Roman readers.

Matthew relates these same things, as well as many others, often even using the same expressions; but he abstains from any addition by way of explanation, taking it for granted that all was familiar to his readers already.

Luke makes numerous observations of a geographical nature, in order to inform his friend Theophilus, (for whose use primarily the work was composed,) as far as possible in consistency with due brevity, in regard to the places which were the theatre of particular events.

This is not Matthew's custom. As he deems it superfluous to add explanatory observations in respect to manners, customs, and opinions, peculiar as they all were to Palestine, so likewise as to geography, he seems to have no apprehension that his narrative might be obscure and unintelligible to any one of his readers from ignorance of the country, cities, etc.

In the twenty-second chapter, he does indeed attempt to assist the reader to comprehend definitely the objection of the Sadducees, by reminding him that they deny the resurrection: οἱ λέγοντες μὴ εἶναι ἀνάστασιν; but this explanation was necessary even to many of his own countrymen, for the opinions of this sect, though liked by the rich and powerful, as they favoured their dissolute mode of life, were (as we are told by Josephus,) far from being current among the people.<sup>1</sup>

Now whether he pursued this course because he intended his work for his own countrymen only, or because he had not had opportunity by travelling, as had Mark and Luke, to observe the customs of different nations and their dissimilarity from those of the Jews, the inference must be the same; and we see from the author's procedure, that Palestine was his circle of vision, and that the Jews of that country, or such foreigners as frequently came thither and were familiar with its customs, manners and peculiarities, were uppermost in his mind while preparing his narrative.

### § 3.

In considering, too, the practical scope of his history and the reflections which he makes upon the actions of Jesus, the purpose and view with which he wrote are apparent. He frequently affords us an opportunity of seeing clearly what, in his opinion, it was most important for his readers to understand. So long as a writer merely details events, he leaves us to pass our own judgment upon them; but as soon as he begins to make reflections of his own, he ceases to be a bare narrator of facts, lets us into his own mind and makes us participate in his purposes and views.

All Matthew's reflections are of one kind. He shews us, as to every thing that Jesus did and taught, that it was characteristic of the Mes-

<sup>1</sup> Joseph. Ant. L. XVIII. c. 1. § 4.

siah. On occasion of remarkable events or a recital of parts of the discourses of Jesus, he refers us to the ancient Scriptures of the Jews, in which this coming Savior is delineated, and shows, in detail, that the great ideal, which flitted before the minds of the prophets, was realized in Jesus. This idea he carries with him through his whole narrative; while Mark and Luke seldom quote passages from the Old Testament, and generally never except when they are put into the mouth of some person speaking in the history, in which case they are parts of the narration, and not the reflections of the historian himself. Without reckoning the passages Matt. 1: 23. 2: 6, 15, 18, the following, 3: 3. 4: 14. 8: 17. 12: 17. 13: 35. 21: 4. 26: 56. 27: 9, are each quoted with the words: ὅπως ἵνα πληρωθῇ τὸ ῥηθὲν, and taken together in their connexion and situation, leave no doubt in respect to the main purpose of the writer.

This book, therefore, deserved to be denominated *εὐαγγέλιον*, or the cheering annunciation of the Messiah, an appellation which was subsequently applied to all the other biographies of Jesus, although their particular design was very different from that of Matthew.

#### § 4.

If it was the principal aim of the writer to show that Jesus was the Messiah, it must have been his object not so much to present a complete history chronologically arranged and descending to the minutest details, as to bring events under one general view which should display the dignity of his person and character, and to select facts that would exhibit a bold outline which was not to be filled up minutely. This Matthew has done. At the commencement of the ministry of Jesus, he presents in one view a summary of his doctrines drawn from many discourses, combining them in the well-known Sermon on the Mount, which, as is now admitted, consists of several discourses delivered at different times. In like manner he has thrown together the parables of Jesus, though delivered at different times and places, into one collection (Chap. 13, 14), these parables affording proof that Jesus corresponded with the promised Saviour in respect to his mode of teaching, viz. in parables, which was foretold by the prophets to be a characteristic of the Messiah (13: 35). The aim of the writer, therefore, would lead us to expect, not so much a biography arranged in chronological order, as a concise exhibition of the character and objects of Jesus, containing facts selected for this special purpose, and excluding all details which that did not require. As the Platonic father, Justin Martyr, denominates the Gospels generally, *ἀπομνημονεύματα*, we might compare this book of Matthew with Xenophon's *Memorabilia*, to which it has an evident resemblance in its plan and arrangement.

#### § 5.

From some hints scattered in the book, it would seem that a long period elapsed after the events before the time when it was composed. Matthew often avers that traces of certain occurrences still existed in the country at the time when he wrote, and expresses himself as one



would speak of things that happened a considerable while ago. (27: 8. 28: 15.)

In narrating the condemnation of Jesus, he explains a circumstance which he must have thought would not be perfectly familiar to his readers. The circumstance is that of Pilate's proposing Jesus and Barabbas to the people, that they might set one of them at liberty, to which Matthew adds the remark, that it was customary at that feast for the Prætor to liberate any one prisoner whom the people desired. (27: 15.) This was a circumstance which, as an immunity founded on custom, could not very soon be forgotten.<sup>1</sup>

The passage, 23: 35, which mentions Zacharias, the son of Barachias, who was slain between the temple and the altar, is still more decisive in fixing definitely upon the time at which the Gospel was composed. There cannot be a doubt, if we attend to the name, the fact, its circumstances, and the object of Jesus in citing it, that it was the same *Ζαχαρίας Βαρούχου*, who, according to Josephus, a short time before the destruction of Jerusalem, was unjustly slain in the midst of the temple. The name is the same, the murder and the remarkable circumstance which distinguishes it correspond, as well as the character of the man, *τὸ λίαν τ' ἀνδρὸς μισοπόνηρον*, his strict probity, and likewise his speaking the truth undauntedly to the Jews, as did the wise men and prophets. Moreover, when Jesus says, that all the innocent blood which had been shed, from Abel to Zacharias, should be avenged upon the Jews, the *ἀπὸ* and *ἕως* denote the beginning and the end of a period, put for all the events coming between. The period ends with Zacharias; he was to be the last before this vengeance should be executed. The threatened vengeance, however, is, that Jerusalem shall be given up to destruction and become desolate. (23: 37, 38.) Must it not then have been the same Zacharias, whose death is distinguished in history, among so many murdered, as that of the only righteous man between the death of Ananias the High Priest and the destruction of the Holy City?

The Zacharias who is mentioned in 2 Chron. 24: 20, 21, is not the one here intended. He was a son of Jehoida, put to death, not between the temple and the altar, or *ἐν μέσῳ τῆς ναῦς*, but in the court; nor was he the last of those unjustly slain, or one with whom an epoch in the Jewish annals terminates. Was there no other righteous man slain after the days of king Joash, in which this happened? and were not the others to be avenged? Was punishment then inflicted for all the innocent blood that had been shed? Was that period an epoch in history, remarkable as a period of general judgment upon the Jewish nation?

It is plain, moreover, that this Zacharias is represented by Jesus as a person yet to come. He says: I send you wise men and prophets, whom ye shall scourge, slay and persecute, *μαστιγώσετε, σταυρώσετε, διώξετε*, that the punishment of all innocent blood from Abel to Zacharias may come upon you. Here Zacharias terminates the list of right-

---

<sup>1</sup> This and the subsequent observations from which I have ventured to draw an inference respecting the time when the book was composed, have, since their first publication, obtained the concurrence of a celebrated scholar. See Eichhorn's *Einleit.* in *N. T. I. Th.* p. 507. seq.



eous persons on whom the Jews were subsequently to lay hands, whom they were yet to scourge and crucify, and for whose blood they were to be answerable.

Jesus, therefore, spoke prophetically of the Zacharias whom Josephus mentions (*Bell. Jud. IV. c. 6. n. 4*), whose death occurred long after Christ. Now Matthew, in relating the words of Jesus, represents him through the whole prophetic passage as expressing himself in the future tense and speaking of Zacharias as one yet to suffer; but when he comes to the murder, he reveals his knowledge that it had already taken place, and, instead of putting the fact, as he should have done, into the mouth of our Lord in the future tense, he speaks of it expressly as an event already past, and says: *ὃν ἐφονεύσατε μεταξὺ* etc., whom ye slew between the temple and the altar.

The event occurred some time after the conquest of Gamala, which took place in the month Hyperberetæus, our October. After this Josephus reckons one spring and one winter, then a summer in which the death of Nero occurred. Here then we have the time of the occurrence of this event, which was in the mind of the writer, when he composed his book, as a thing that had already taken place.

Another circumstance of a similar kind thrown out in his book refers us to the same period. In a conversation in regard to the destruction of the temple and of the Jews as a nation, (c. 24,) Jesus tells his disciples the signs of the approach of this event, and in particular, one relative to the temple, which, when perceived, was to be the signal for flight. When, says he, ye shall see the *βδέλυγμα τῆς ἐρημώσεως* standing in the holy place, then flee. History has preserved but two occurrences in the temple before its entire destruction, to which this expression is applicable, and which, on account of their intimate relation to the destruction of this splendid edifice and of the whole country, may be regarded as prognostics and occasions of destruction and ruin. The second of these, however, was but a sequel of the first. The wildest of the zealots, a band of robbers, who assumed the appellation of zealots for their country, took possession of the temple, made the sanctuary a place of arms and the seat of their tyranny and murderous deeds. The high priest Ananias, who still hoped to effect a reconciliation with the Romans, attempted to expel the zealots from the temple; but in vain. Henceforth they continued the dominant party, making the temple a fortress and the centre of the war, from which they directed the fate of Jerusalem and in which they maintained themselves against the Romans until it was destroyed by fire.

Thus was the holy place defiled by detestable deeds; the abomination of desolation was in its midst. Even Josephus sees in these events the presage of the inevitable destruction of the whole state according to the prediction of the prophets.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *Ἐγέλατό τε τὰ θεῖα, καὶ τοὺς τῶν προφητῶν θεσμούς, ὥσπερ ἀνερτικὰς λογοποιίας ἐγχεύαζον. Πολλὰ δὲ οὗτοι περὶ ἀρετῆς καὶ κακίας προειδέσπισαν, ἃ παραβάντες οἱ ἔηλονται, καὶ τὴν κατὰ τῆς πατρίδος προφητείαν τέλους ἤξισαν. Ἦν γὰρ δὴ καὶ τις παλαιὸς λόγος ἀνδρῶν ἔνθα τότε τὴν πόλιν αὐτῶν καταφλεγῆσθαι τὰ ἅγια νόμῳ πολέμου, στάσις ἴαν κατασκήψη, καὶ χεῖρες οἰκταὶ* *ΠΡΟΜΗΛΑΝΩΣΙ* τὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ τέμενος; κ. τ. λ. (*Bell. Jud. L. IV. c. 6. n. 3.*)

They had not long held the temple, when in order to make sure of its continued possession and of superiority over those who were peaceably disposed, they called to their aid the Idumeans, a heathen people, who not only profaned the temple by their unholy presence, but even perpetrated a horrible massacre within it, so that the outer temple streamed with blood.

It matters not to our purpose which of these two events, if they may be regarded as distinct, be considered the *βδέλυγμα τῆς ἐρημώσεως*. They are certainly the only events which history presents, that can be thus designated, or rather they are the only remarkable occurrences relative to the temple, previous to its complete destruction, which are mentioned in history at all. Both took place immediately before the death of Zacharias.

Now when Matthew, in recounting the language of our Lord on this subject, comes to what he said respecting the abomination of desolation in the temple, he suddenly interrupts our Saviour's words with an apostrophe to his readers: "When ye, therefore, shall see the abomination of desolation, spoken of by Daniel the prophet, stand in the holy place, *whoso readeth let him understand*, then let them which be in Judea flee to the mountains."

Matthew must have found occasion for this exclamation in the existing condition of things. As the passage relates to the signal for flight, and he exhorts his readers not to let it pass unnoticed, it must have existed and been apparent then; the admonition of Jesus must have referred to events of that period, and the sign, *the abomination of desolation in the holy place*, τὸ βδέλυγμα τῆς ἐρημώσεως, ἑστὼς ἐν τόπῳ ἁγίῳ, must have made a deep impression on his mind.

Such were the circumstances of the time when Matthew wrote the last chapters of his book. The passage cannot have been written at a later period. When these scenes occurred in Jerusalem, the Romans were already in possession of Galilee, and were on the eve of conquering Judea. Had they already taken it, the warning to the inhabitants of Judea to take advantage of this signal for flight would have been useless.

## § 6.

These circumstances, moreover, were the immediate inducements to his undertaking and to the plan of his work. Both during and before the civil commotions of the Jews, as we are assured by Josephus, Tacitus, and Suetonius, the idea was current among them that the time was not far distant in which their deliverer and the restorer of their independence, the Messiah, would appear. This belief, as is observed by the writers above mentioned, contributed in no small degree to animate their resolution to begin the war and to maintain it with obstinacy.

The rebellion which was commenced against the Romans united the whole nation together in one common interest. With fanatical enthusiasm all again became Jews; and Christianity must thus have lost many of its followers.

In the midst of such ideas and circumstances, Matthew wrote his sketch of the actions, doctrines, and miracles of Jesus, referring to the ancient sacred books in which, confessedly, were scattered the lineaments

of the Messiah's portrait. He proved that he had already appeared in the person of Jesus of Nazareth, that his life and his actions accorded remarkably with the representations of the prophets. This was a grievous attack upon the raised hopes and the delusions of the leading insurgents, as well as upon the principal ground on which they had swayed public opinion.

Many might learn from this book, in which Jesus foretold the destruction of the religious and civil constitution, the temple and the holy city, how little success was to attend the present efforts, and how much more to their advantage it would be to continue faithful to the patient sect of Christians.

It would have a tendency, too, when the temple was actually destroyed, and all the splendour of the Jewish worship, feasts and sacrifices had come to an end, to cause a considerable part of the surviving Jews to embrace Christianity and, after the accomplishment of these events, the occurrence of which had been foretold so early in his book by Jesus, to acknowledge him as their Teacher and their king Messiah, who had founded a kingdom of virtue and truth for the children of Israel. The work was designed to preserve from apostasy those who were already disciples of Christianity, and to prepare the way for future conversions from Judaism.

### § 7.

Such was the result. The new system had many steadfast adherents among the Jews, and after the destruction of Jerusalem gained many more, who, however, in Palestine and every where else, were reluctant to abandon any part of Judaism, but wished to unite it with the religion of the Messiah. They were themselves divided in their tenets, and formed two sects known under the name of Nazarenes and Ebionites.

The Ebionites were particularly distinguished by their ardent adherence to the Law and to Judaism, and by peculiar tenets in regard to Christ's superior nature. They rejected all the religious books of the Christians, and had in their stead a single historical account of the acts of Jesus which they called *κατὰ Ματθαῖον*,<sup>1</sup> and which, from its being composed in the Hebrew language, is also called *εὐαγγέλιον καθ' Εβραίους*.<sup>2</sup>

The Nazarenes, also, who were skilled in the Hebrew language and continued till a late period to read in that language the sacred books of their nation, retained their ancient reverence for the religion of their fathers, and likewise possessed a Jewish representation of the Christian doctrines in a work which is cited under the title *τὸ καθ' Εβραίους εὐαγγέλιον*; sometimes, though seldom, under the title *κατὰ Ματθαῖον*; and which, as a book relative to the Messiah, may have been regarded as a supplement to their Jewish canon.

The question hence arises: May not Matthew have originally written his Gospel in the Hebrew language?

<sup>1</sup> Irenæus. L. I. Adv. Hær. c. 26. L. III. c. 11.

<sup>2</sup> Euseb. H. E. L. III. c. 27. Epiphan. Hæres. XXX.



## § 8.

In fact, we are assured from another quarter, viz. by orthodox fathers, that this was the case: Papias says: Matthew wrote his history in the Hebrew language.<sup>1</sup> This testimony, it is true, loses very much of its weight, as Eusebius, through whom it comes to us, observes at the same time that this father was of very weak understanding, *πάνν σμικρὸς τὸν νοῦν*. Eusebius, who possessed his writings, could judge more correctly on this point than we can; but as Papias has been taken under the protection of learned men, (who might wish him somewhat more acute to suit their purpose,) we will readily admit that he was only a little weak of understanding.<sup>2</sup>

If we were not to consider the subject of our inquiry as a critical question, and were to regard his testimony not as his own account, but as merely committed to writing by him, he would merit some attention, inasmuch as he is represented by the ancients to have been very industrious in the collection of oral traditions, from which his writings were subsequently compiled.

But in this case, as we are not previously assured of the writer's judgment, it is important that we should be informed of the sources whence his (no doubt) honest statements were derived, to make amends for his limited discernment. These authorities, which were necessary, on account of his feeble abilities, to accredit what he says, Papias has not adduced.

Is it not possible that he derived his account of a Hebrew text of Matthew from the sect of the Ebionites or the Nazarenes? and if he did, of what value would his statement be?

He certainly received direct or indirect information from that quarter, particularly in respect to the Gospel of the Hebrews, a passage of which he cited in his writings. He quotes, likewise, (says Eusebius, *H. E. L. III. fin.*) from the first Epistle of John, also from the first of Peter, and expatiates upon a story of a woman accused before our Lord of many sins, which is contained in the Gospels of the Jewish Christians: *ἦν τὸ κατ' Ἑβραίων εὐαγγέλιον περιέχει.*

Now how much confidence can the historical inquirer repose in the testimony of a man, who always relied upon reports and oral traditions, whose capacity of judging concerning them was very limited, and whose authorities, according to clear indications in this particular case, are very suspicious?

I do not assert, as I have been charged with asserting, that either Papias or Eusebius himself read the Jewish Gospel; but only that the

<sup>1</sup> Euseb. *H. E. L. III. c. 39.* *Περὶ δὲ Ματθαίου ταῦτα εἰρήταις· Ματθαῖος μὲν οὖν Ἑβραϊδὶ διαλέκτῳ τὰ λόγια συνεγράψατο.*

<sup>2</sup> The severe judgment of Eusebius is founded, not merely (as Michaelis supposes, in his *Introd. Th. II. §. 133*, 4th ed.) on the fact that Papias believed in a Millennium, and understood certain parables too literally, but on the whole tenor of his writings, in which he adopted as genuine the most absurd parables and discourses attributed to our Lord, and many other fabulous things, *καὶ τινὰ ἄλλα μυθικώτερα*, among which was the Millennium. The stories which Eusebius has extracted from him are not the standard by which we should judge of him. He naturally selected for his history, not what was most fabulous, but what was most useful and most probable.



former, as he always depended upon ancient traditions, probably received information second or third hand from Jewish Christians. We have even some evidence of this in his compilations, for one narrative contained in the Jewish Gospel was specified by him on account of its singularity. The words: *ἦν τὸ καθ' Ἑβραίων εὐαγγέλιον περιέχει*, do not necessarily belong to Eusebius as a remark of his own; they may have been in the account given by Papias, to whom the story may have come with this addition.

The objection that Eusebius has designated the authority Papias had for his statement, viz. John the Presbyter,<sup>1</sup> would be of much more importance, if it were not based on an assumption. John is, indeed, spoken of before in reference to the Gospel of Mark; but Eusebius does not say that the subsequent statement in respect to the Gospel of Matthew comes from the same source. We have no right to add any thing to him, but must take him as he is. He separates the two accounts, concludes the first and then begins the second: *περὶ δὲ τοῦ Ματθαίου ταῦτα εἴρηται*, where undoubtedly, we must supply *τῷ Παπῖα*; but we are far from being authorised to understand: *ὑφηγήσαντος τοῦ αὐτοῦ πρεσβυτέρου*. We shall refer to this testimony again hereafter. (§ 11.)

The next who makes these assertions is Irenæus.<sup>2</sup> *Matthew*, says he, *published his Gospel among the Jews in their own language*. Irenæus, however, was not only so well acquainted with Papias that he may be suspected of borrowing his account from him, but valued him highly, and mentions him with so high an encomium for Irenæus to bestow, that we may find in it, not merely ground for a supposition, but a pretty clear indication that if he had read this account in Papias he would have regarded it as perfectly authentic. This, says he, in reference to the point of which he is treating, *is recorded by Papias, who was one of John's hearers, a contemporary of Polycarp, one of the ancients, in the fourth book of his ἐξήγησίων λογίων κυριακῶν*.

With Irenæus it was amply sufficient reason why his account should be received with entire confidence, that he was contemporary and acquainted with Polycarp, whom Irenæus venerated very highly. Now in forming our opinion whether Irenæus depended upon Papias, let all these facts be considered together; and to these it may be added that, in the same passage in which he heaps these encomiums upon Papias, he rests his belief in a millennium upon the authority of this father. (*L. V. Adv. Hær. c. 33.*)

Now it was this very work, here quoted and eulogized by Irenæus, which contained the account of the Hebrew text of Matthew, and which Eusebius cites as above stated; so that there can be no doubt that Irenæus himself saw and read this statement of Papias in his writings. (*H. E. L. III. fin.*)

The third witness is Origen, according to *Euseb. H. E. L. VI. c. 25*. This father possessed a particular acquaintance with languages and much

<sup>1</sup> Prof. Hermann Olshausen, "Die Echtheit der kanonischen vier Evangelien aus der Geschichte der zwey ersten Jahrhundertes." Königsb. 1823. p. 23 and 92.

<sup>2</sup> Iren. L. III. Adv. Hær. c. 1. Euseb. H. E. L. V. c. 8.

general knowledge, and we might expect from him, on account of the importance of the subject, an opinion founded on deep investigation. He was capable of deciding the question properly. But the writer through whom his declaration respecting the Hebrew text of this Gospel comes to us, honestly observes, that the assertion of Origen was not the result of any critical research, but that he appealed to tradition in its behalf: *ὡς ἐν παραδόσει μαθάν.* Now if the *παράδοσις* was worthy of credence, it came from ancient and respectable fathers. Such an one was indeed current when Origen wrote, and we know its author. There were Christian fathers and Jewish Christians who concurred with it, and formed the common opinion on which Origen's judgment was founded.

Eusebius himself is the last witness that deserves attention. (*H. E. L. III. c. 24.*) This learned man asserts that the original text of Matthew was Hebrew; he likewise denies this position. As a historian and collector, following authorities which, as we see, he faithfully specifies, he asserts it; but as a philologist and biblical investigator he arrives at a different conclusion. In his commentary on the Psalms he remarks, that Matthew, as one who was himself master of the Hebrew language, cited the words: *φθέγξομαι προβλήματα ἀπ' ἀρχῆς* (Ps. 77,) according to his own translation (he is commenting on the Greek phraseology employed by the LXX, whom Matthew deserted, rendering the passage differently) as follows: *ἀντὶ τοῦ φθέγξομαι ἀπ' ἀρχῆς, Ἑβραϊὸς ὣν ὁ Ματθαῖος οὐκ εἶρα ἐκδύσει κέχρηται εἰπὼν ἐκρεύξομαι κεκρυμμένα κ. τ. λ.*<sup>1</sup>

Now, if we trace all the testimonies to their source we find that the entire historical deduction in behalf of a Hebrew original of Matthew rests on the declaration of the Jewish Christians, a sect of whom, called Ebionites, possessed a book in their language which they called *κατὰ Ματθαῖον*, and, like every other sect, boasted that theirs was the only authentic and complete religious book,<sup>2</sup> in which allegation, perhaps, the Nazarenes likewise concurred with them, and in favor of which they contrived to prepossess some of the Christian fathers, through whom the statement gained additional credit and currency.

## § 9.

But might not even Jewish Christians tell the truth and be worthy of credence? The Ebionites formed a numerous body among the adhe-

<sup>1</sup> "May he not have written in Syriac, and thus have translated the passage from the Hebrew into Syriac? Eusebius asserts elsewhere (*Dem. Evang. L. III. p. 73. and 88. Rob. Steph.*) that the Apostles understood no language but Syriac." *Theol. Quartalschrift. Tübingen. 1822. 3tes. Heft. p. 462.* He has, indeed, asserted this, without considering that in that case the whole N. T. must have been written in Syriac. In his commentaries, however, a later work, he speaks differently, and exactly as I have stated the matter. He says that Matthew abandoned the phraseology of the LXX, and like a Hebraist, translated in his own way: *ἐκρεύξομαι κ. τ. λ.* "Aquila, however, has in his translation, instead of this, *ὁμβρήσω αἰνίγματα ἐξ ἀρχῆθεν*; and Symmachus, *ἀναβλέσω προβλήματα ἀρχαῖα.*" (p. 463, 464.) Did Matthew, then, write his Gospel in Syriac and cite passages in it from the O. T. in the Greek Language?

<sup>2</sup> *Τῶν δὲ λοιπῶν (ἐν ἀγγελίῳ) μικρὸν ἐποιεῖτο λόγον.* Eusb. *H. E. L. III. c. 27.*

rents to Christianity, and on this account, together with that of their antiquity, their statement lays claim to our attention.

The more ancient records assign their origin to a much earlier period than some later historians. Irenæus, who mentions the Ebionites, (*L. I. c. 26.*) speaks of them next after Cerinthus, immediately before the Nicolaitans; Eusebius, however, places them next to Menander, the disciple of Simon, before Cerinthus and the Nicolaitans. In this arrangement, it is clear, he followed the order of time; for, after speaking of the Ebionites, he proceeds: *About the same time, κατὰ τοὺς δεδηλομένους χρόνους*, appeared Cerinthus, another leader of the heretics; *lastly with these also, ἐπὶ τοῦτον ὄντα*, (he says in the following paragraph,) the heresy of the Nicolaitans. (*H. E. L. III. c. 26, 27, 28.*) Jerome mentions among the heretics whom John opposes in his Gospel, the then rising sect of the Ebionites, "*et maxime tunc Ebionitarum dogma consurgens.*" (*Catal. V. Jo. and Proëm. in Matth.*) Epiphanius says, that according to the accounts which had come down to him, the sect of the Ebionites took its rise at the time, when, after the destruction of Jerusalem, the Christians settled in Peræa, particularly in Pella and the adjoining region. (*Her. XXX.*) In the time of Hadrian, they already reckoned among their number such distinguished men as Theodotion and Aquila, and, as early probably, among their opponents Justin Martyr, who, as we are informed by Theodoret, wrote in opposition to them. We know that his book against the heretics was of older date than his apology, because this refers to the former and was composed very shortly after the second Jewish war, which he calls in it *τὸν νῦν γεγόμενον πόλεμον*.

Respecting the antiquity and rise of the Nazarenes, we have not so certain information. They were sometimes omitted by the Hæresiology, either because they were included by them among the Ebionites, or because they were regarded with more favor.

Their book, like that of the Ebionites, is no longer extant; but several fragments of it which have been preserved, afford us materials for judging respecting it. To do this, we must see how far into antiquity its existence can be traced, and what part of its actual contents can be discovered, in order that we may not decide *a priori* a historical question which must be settled by evidence.

The writer who has treated this subject most at length, is Jerome. He himself obtained this book from the Nazarenes, and translated it into the Greek and Latin languages. This clearly shows that he was familiarly acquainted with it; and he is to be considered as authority in investigations respecting it. He himself guides us as to its antiquity, and furnishes some data for determining the period at which it originated. In particular, he informs us that Origen sometimes quoted it in his writings, and of this we may now be convinced on comparison. In such works of both as are still extant, there are appeals to the same passages in this Gospel. Jerome in his commentary on Micah 8: 6 says: "*Qui . . . crediderit Evangelio quod secundum Hebræos editum nuper transtulimus, in quo de personâ Salvatoris dicitur: Modo tulit me mater mea spiritus sanctus in uno capillorum meorum, non dubitabit dicere sermonem Dei ortum esse de spiritu, et animam quæ sponsa sermonis est, habere socrum s. spiritum, qui apud Hebræos*



genere dicitur fœminino.”—Origen, in his fifteenth Homily on Jeremiah and in his Commentary on John,<sup>1</sup> says: *ἐὰν δὲ προσέται τις τὸ καθ’ Ἑβραίους εὐαγγέλιον, ἔνθα αὐτὸς ὁ σωτὴρ φησιν, ἄρτι ἔλαβέ με ἡ μήτηρ μου τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα ἐν μία τῶν τριῶν μου καὶ ἀπένεγκέ με εἰς τὸ ὄρος τὸ μέγα Θάβωρ.* There are, therefore, evident traces of its existence thus early, and even as far back as the time of Origen’s preceptor,<sup>2</sup> if he meant the same as his pupil by *τὸ καθ’ Ἑβραίους εὐαγγέλιον*. He presents us the following passage from it: *ὁ θαυμάσας βασιλεύσει καὶ ὁ βασιλεύσας ἀναπανθήσεται.*

There are indications of its existence very much earlier, which are capable of being moulded into a systematic argument. Ignatius, the Martyr, in his Epistle to the church at Smyrna, mentions some words of Jesus which are not in our Gospels, but, to judge from the connexion, were taken from some written document. They are the following: *καὶ ὅτε πρὸς τοὺς περὶ Πέτρον ἦλθεν, ἔφην αὐτοῖς, λάβετε, ψηλαγήσαί με καὶ ἴδετε, ὅτι οὐκ εἰμι δαιμόνιον ἀσώματον, καὶ εὐθὺς αὐτοῦ ἤψαντο, καὶ ἐπίστευσαν.*

If a Gospel of the Hebrews was in existence, the bishop of Antioch in Syria would very probably from his situation possess it, and could hardly be unacquainted with it. The words, too, really stood in the Jewish Gospel, from which Jerome has extracted them in part in the preface to his eighteenth book on Isaiah: “Cum enim eum putarent spiritum, vel juxta Evangelium, quod Hebraicum lectitant Nazareni, *incorporale dæmonium*, dixit eis, quid turbati estis et cogitationes ascendunt in corda vestra, videte manus meas et pedes meos, etc.” But in his catalogue of Christian writers, he expressly asserts, in treating of Ignatius, that these very words were found in the Jewish Gospel: “Scripsit et ad Smy-næos, in quo et de Evangelio, quod nuper a me translatus est, super personâ Christi ponit testimonium dicens. . . . *Et quando venit ad Petrum et ad eos, qui cum Petro erant, dixit eis; Ecce, palpate me et videte, quia non sum dæmonium incorporale: et statim tetigerunt eum et crediderunt.*”

From these observations, the book is probably of high antiquity, and its origin dates at a period reached by the Apostles or shortly after. It would appear from the fragments which yet exist in the productions of the Latin father, that it was neither very like, nor very unlike, to Matthew.

In the remotest period in which the existence of the Jewish Gospel is capable of being shown and attested by historical proof, it appears to have been so different from our Matthew, that there is no ground from their contents to suppose the identity of the two writings. The evidences of its existence contained in Origen and Clement are as many proofs of its dissimilarity to Matthew; and that portion of history which relates to the events after the resurrection, to which the passage cited from Ignatius refers, is not treated at all by Matthew. Consequently, judging from the most

<sup>1</sup> Fabric. Cod. Apocryph. Nov. Test. P. I. p. 362. Ed. Hamb. 1719. These passages are likewise collected in the “Neue Untersuchung über das Alter und Ansehen des Evangeliums der Hebræer,” by Chr. Frederick Weber. Tubing. 1806. 8vo.

<sup>2</sup> Clem. Alexandr. Lib. III. Strom. c. 9.



ancient evidences, it did not, in the earliest period of its existence, nor even in its plan, agree with our Matthew.

Yet, although this book, according to the data we possess for determining its age and contents, was a different work from Matthew, still the time of its origin, which very nearly approaches that of our Savior, confers upon it some historical value. The appreciation of its value is left by Origen, whenever he makes use of it, to the judgment of his readers; but it is unconditionally assumed by Ignatius the Martyr, as to the passage above mentioned. It was not, it is true, without absurdities, as is shown by the story that the Holy Spirit in the character of mother of Jesus, carried her son by one of his hairs to the top of Mount Tabor; but this would not justify us in pronouncing the whole to be valueless, though it would justify us in subjecting its particular parts, did we possess it entire, to a very rigid scrutiny. Some passages of it which have been preserved contain sentiments which are really of such a nature as not to be unworthy of our Lord, and may have been expressed by him in his character of teacher. We are told by Jerome, (e. g. *Comment. in Ezek. XXIV. 7*), that in this Gospel it was declared a great sin for any one to grieve the mind of his brother; and in another place (*Comm. in Ephes. V. 4*), that our Lord was represented as saying to his disciples: Never be more joyful than when you see your brother happy—two admonitions in perfect accordance with the elevated spirit of Christianity.

We are told by Jerome, that the Gospel of the Ebionites (for they likewise had a Hebrew Gospel,) was no other than the Nazarene Gospel, which was used in common by the two sects. This father was master of the Hebrew language, and while in Palestine was habitually conversant with the Nazarenes, and probably with the Ebionites.<sup>1</sup> We should therefore be released from all further inquiry, in regard to the age, value, and purport of the Ebionite Gospel, had not Epiphanius, a native of Palestine, educated among the Jews and in their language, given us extracts from the Gospel of the Ebionites, which make us distrustful of Jerome's statement. Among some other fragments, he has extracted from it the history of Jesus' baptism (*Hær. XXX.*), which the Latin father has likewise inserted from the Nazarene Gospel in his Commentary on Isaiah 4: 12. The narratives in the two books are so entirely dissimilar, that not a trace can be perceived of even original resemblance; as may be here seen from comparison.

<sup>1</sup> "In Evangelio, quo utuntur Nazareni et Ebionitæ, quod nuper in Græcum de Hebræo sermone transtulimus." (*Comment. in Matth. XII. 13.*)

Factum est autem, cum ascendisset Dominus de aquâ, et fons omnis spiritus sancti descendit et requievit super eum, et dixit illi : fili, in omnibus prophetis exspectabam te, ut venires et requiescerem super te, tu es enim requies mea, tu es filius meus primogenitus, qui regnas in sempiternum.

Τοῦ τε λαοῦ βαπτισθέντος ἦλθε Ἰησοῦς καὶ ἐβαπτίσθη ὑπὸ τοῦ Ἰωάννου. Καὶ ὡς ἀνῆλθεν ἐκ τοῦ ὕδατος, ἠνοίγησαν οἱ οὐρανοὶ, καὶ εἶδε τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ Θεοῦ τὸ ἅγιον ἔν εἶδει περιστερᾶς κατελθούσης εἰς αὐτόν, καὶ φωνὴ ἐγένετο ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ λέγουσα· σὺ μου εἶς ὁ υἱὸς ὁ ἀγαπητός, ἐν σοὶ εὐδόκησα ἐγὼ σήμερον γεγέννηκά σε. Καὶ εὐθὺς περιέλαμψε τὸν τόπον ὡς μέγα, ὁ ἰδὼν ὁ Ἰωάννης λέγει αὐτῷ· σὺ τίς εἶ κύριε; καὶ πάλιν φωνὴ ἐξ οὐρανοῦ πρὸς αὐτόν· οὗτος ἐστὶν ὁ υἱὸς μου, ὁ ἀγαπητός ἐφ' ὃν εὐδόκησα. Καὶ τότε Ἰωάννης προσπέσων αὐτῷ λέγει· δέομαί σου κύριε, σὺ με βάπτισον. Ὁ δὲ ἐκάλυεν αὐτῷ ἄφες, ὅτι οὕτως ἐστὶ πρόπον πληρωθῆναι πάντα.

It has been conjectured, out of respect for the testimony of the Latin father as to a matter concerning which circumstances would lead us to suppose he must have had accurate knowledge, that Epiphanius, who, as he himself says, discussed the Ebionite system and the opinions of the Elksaites or Sampsæans together, by mistake confounded their tenets and their religious books.<sup>1</sup> But he was far too well acquainted with the writings of this branch of the Jewish school, an account of which is given by him in his treatise on the Ossæans and Sampsæans, to do this; and the care he takes to distinguish the Ebionite tenets declares the contrary. He did indeed connect these Jewish sects together, on account of the similarity of their tenets, but he paid suitable attention to the points of difference. After stating some opinions peculiar to the Sampsæans, he adds, that in these they differ from Ebion : ἤδη δέ μοι καὶ ἀνωτέρω προδεδήλωται, ὡς ταῦτα μὲν Ἐβίων οὐκ ἤδει. A little further on, he distinguishes the opinions of the ancient Ebionite sect from those defended by its later disciples : ποτε μὲν αὐτοὺς Ἐβίων λέγων ἐκ παρατριβῆς ψιλὸν ἄνθρωπον γεγενῆσθαι ἄλλοτε δὲ οἱ ἀπ' αὐτοῦ Ἐβιοναῖοι. Such procedure proves that we need not fear being misled by a confusion of subjects.

It was therefore the Ebionite book from which he derived these extracts; and however little it may resemble the Nazarene Gospel of Jerome, yet the Cyprian bishop seems to agree with the account of the Latin father. He speaks of both works under the same denominations, viz. κατὰ Ματθαῖον and εὐαγγέλιον Ἑβραϊκόν. He seems to derive them both from Matthew, and to ascribe their difference entirely to corruptions, omissions and additions, designating it by the expressions,

<sup>1</sup> Storr, "Über den Zweck der evang. Geschichte und der Briefe Johannis." § 38. § 61.

πληρέστατον and οὐ πληρέστατον καὶ νενοθευμένον,<sup>1</sup> whence he did not know whether the Nazarenes retained or rejected the genealogies.

The following reason, too, for supposing an original identity, may be worthy of consideration. Jerome applies to the Nazarene Gospel the denomination *secundum apostolos*. "In Evangelio. . . quo utuntur usque hodie Nazareni, secundum apostolos, sive, ut plerique autumant, juxta Matthæum" (*Lib. III. Adv. Pelag.*); by which expression the contents are referred, not to Matthew alone, but to all the Apostles. This agrees with the Ebionite Gospel; for at its commencement they are all represented as speaking of themselves in the first person: *There was a man, named Jesus, who, when he was thirty years old, made choice of us*; and then follows an enumeration, made by Jesus himself, of the names of the twelve, among whom in particular our Lord says to Matthew: *And thee also, Matthew, did I call, while thou was sitting at the receipt of custom.*<sup>2</sup>

As all the Apostles speak of themselves in this way at the outset, they all declare themselves partakers in the contents, and this Gospel is properly a Gospel *secundum Apostolos*, like that of the Nazarenes, though, as Jesus particularly distinguishes Matthew in his address, the latter may have had a principal share in it, and perhaps have had the entire arrangement of its contents.

But be it as it may, whether there were one or two works originally, neither of the suppositions would lead us to a very flattering inference as to the purity of their evidence, which purity is indispensable to their historic credibility. Supposing this discrepancy to have arisen from arbitrary alterations on the part of the two sects, to annihilate all traces of original resemblance, contrary to the custom of the Jews, who regarded it as wicked and impious to venture such a thing in respect to a book acknowledged to be sacred, can we before the tribunal of criticism, ascribe any high authority to the evidence of men who could proceed thus in regard to a religious book, either from caprice or to make it favor their opinions, although each party calls its book *κατὰ Ματθαῖον*?

If there were originally two different works, it is a certain proof that an excessive attachment to Judaism and a sectarian temper misled one of the sects and induced it to compose a book for itself in conformity with its prejudices and sentiments, or else arbitrarily to constitute some existing Hebrew composition which was most consonant with

<sup>1</sup> Hæres. XXIX. De Nazoræis. "Ἐχονσι δὲ τὸ κατὰ Ματθαῖον εὐαγγέλιον πληρέστατον Ἑβραϊστί. Παρ' αὐτοῖς γὰρ σαφὲς τοῦτο, καθὼς ἐξ ἀρχῆς ἐγράφη, Ἑβραϊκοῖς γράμμασιν ἔτι σῶνεται. Hæres. XXX. De Ebione. Καὶ δέχονται μὲν καὶ αὐτοὶ τὸ κατὰ Ματθαῖον εὐαγγέλιον. . . . καλοῦσι δὲ αὐτὸ καθ' Ἑβραίου, ὡς τὰ ἀληθῆ ἐστὶν εἰπεῖν, ὅτι Ματθαῖος μόνος Ἑβραῖος κ. τ. λ. Ἐν τῷ γοῦν παρ' αὐτοῖς εὐαγγελίῳ, κατὰ Ματθαῖον ὀνομαζομένῳ, οὐκ ὅλη δὲ πληρεστάτῳ, which is not indeed complete, though very full, ἀλλὰ νενοθευμένῳ καὶ ἡκροτησιαμένῳ, κ. τ. λ.

<sup>2</sup> Ἐγένετό τις ἀνὴρ ὀνόματι Ἰησοῦς, καὶ αὐτὸς ὡς ἐτῶν τριάκοντα ἐξελέξατο ἡμᾶς. Καὶ ἐλθὼν εἰς Καφαρναούμ, εἰσῆλθεν εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν Σίμωνος τοῦ ἐπικληθέντος Πέτρον, καὶ ἀνοίξας τὸ στόμα αὐτοῦ εἶπε· παρεσθόμενος παρὰ τὴν λίμνην Τιβηριάδος ἐξελεξάμην Ἰωάννην καὶ Ἰάκωβον, υἱοὺς Ζεβεδαίου, καὶ Σίμωνα, καὶ Ἀνδρέαν, καὶ Θαδδαῖον, καὶ Σίμωνα τὸν Ζηλωτὴν, καὶ Ἰούδαν τὸν Ἰσκαριώτην, καὶ σὺ τὸν Ματθαῖον καθέσμενον ἐπὶ τοῦ τελωνίου, καὶ ἡκολούθησάς μοι.

their ideas, the basis of their religion. Of one party this must indisputably be true; but are not both accused in history of the same Jewish fanaticism, and, according to her accusations against them, were not both equally capable of taking such a step, and alike prompted to it in behalf of their Jewish notions and tenets? Were they not, by the declarations of Jesus found in the genuine Gospels in regard to the Sabbath and other Jewish customs which they wished to be observed, alike compelled to do this, if they desired them to be consistent with their own books and agreeable to themselves? And what, moreover, was more natural than that they should desire to support their writings and tenets by the authority of a name, and should ascribe them to Matthew, or even to all the Apostles?

## § 10.

Matthew wished to be understood in the country, which, in particular, he intended should be acted upon by his Gospel; hence it is not superfluous, in forming a judgment in regard to his situation as an author, to endeavor to get correct ideas of the condition in which he found the language of that country. According to some, the Greek had then made considerable advances by the side of the national language;<sup>1</sup> but if we should listen to others, we might doubt whether any person in Palestine understood Greek; whether Peter, John, James, Jude, or even Matthew, were acquainted with this language, as we might certainly expect a man to be who was engaged in collecting customs.<sup>2</sup> If, however, we cast a glance at the changes which occurred in those countries, we shall come to a very different conclusion.

By the conquest of the Macedonians the condition of Asia underwent many alterations in opinion, manners, science, and language, the history of which will never be fully unfolded for want of documents. What I here say respecting the changes in language, has reference particularly to Palestine.

"What (are the words of an ancient writer) is the meaning of Greek cities in barbarous countries, and the Macedonian language among Indians and Persians?"<sup>3</sup> Even in Media the Macedonians had built Greek cities.<sup>4</sup> On the Tigris, Seleucia was mostly inhabited by Greeks;<sup>5</sup>

<sup>1</sup> The writers on this subject have been specified by Kuinoel, in Fabric. Biblioth. Græc. Ed. Harles. T. IV. L. IV. c. 7. p. 760. To these add "Dominici Diodati J. C. Neapolitani de Christo Græce loquente." 8vo. Neapoli, 1767. I could not obtain this work even in Naples. "Fr. Guil. Schubert. Dissert. quâ in sermonem, quo Evangel. Matthæi conscriptum fuerit, inquiritur." Götting. 1810.

<sup>2</sup> Giambernado de Rossi, "Della lingua propria di Christo," &c. Parma. 8vo. 1772. This work is particularly directed against Diodati. The celebrated author sometimes confounds different periods, often uses poor weapons, but is a stout combatant.

<sup>3</sup> Seneca, De Consolat. ad Helviam, c. 6.

<sup>4</sup> Εἰσὶ δὲ καὶ Ἑλληνίδες πόλεις κτίσματα τῶν Μακεδόνων ἐν τῇ Μηδίᾳ. Strabo, L. XI. p. 524. 2d ed. Casaubon.

<sup>5</sup> Jos. Ant. L. XVIII. c. 9. n. 8. Οἰκοῦσι δὲ αὐτὴν (Σελεύκειαν) πολλοὶ τῶν Μακεδόνων, καὶ πλείστοι Ἕλληνες. Dio Cass. L. XL. p. 128 and 130. ed. 1806. Σελεύκεια πλείστον τὸ Ἑλληνικὸν καὶ νῦν ἔχουσα.



and so likewise, to the south-east, the magnificent Ctesiphon,<sup>1</sup> and to the north-west, Sittace.<sup>2</sup> Babylon became Macedonian; in its suburbs lived Greeks and Macedonians.<sup>3</sup> Up the Euphrates from thence lay Nicephorium, a Greek city, which was surrounded by other Greek cities;<sup>4</sup> and further on, in Mesopotamia, was Carrhæ, a colony of the Macedonians.<sup>5</sup> But, not to enter into detail, we refer the reader to Appian for a long catalogue of cities in further and hither Syria which were denominated Greek.<sup>6</sup> Tigranes, the Armenian, in his march through Syria to Phœnicia, destroyed no less than twelve Greek cities.<sup>7</sup> Between Syria and Babylonia we meet with the ruins of Palmyra, on which are found more Greek than Palmyrene inscriptions.<sup>8</sup> Even some in the Palmyrene character are yet in the Greek language.<sup>9</sup> In hither Syria, on the boundaries of Palestine, and in Palestine itself, the Greeks established themselves in greater numbers, as was natural from the situation and vicinity of these regions. The many commotions which occurred here promoted such settlements. The Ptolemies and Seleucidæ had a long contest for the possession of these countries; both parties introduced Greeks, made them magistrates and inhabitants of the cities, and stationed them there as garrisons.

Antioch, the capital of hither Syria, in close connexion with Palestine, was peopled by its founder with Greeks and Macedonians,<sup>10</sup> and acquired the fame of Greek refinement and science.<sup>11</sup> Macedonians and Greeks, as well as Jews, were introduced as inhabitants, not only into Antioch, but into several cities of Lower Syria, ἐν τῇ κάτω Συρίᾳ.<sup>12</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Josephus, Ibid. n. 9. *Κτησιφῶντα . . . πόλιν Ἑλληνίδα.*

<sup>2</sup> Pliny, H. N. L. VI. c. 31. "Oppidum ejus Sittace Græcorum: ab ortu est." It should be thus pointed: "Oppidum ejus Sittace Græcorum: ab ortu est Sabbata; ab occasu autem Antiochia."

<sup>3</sup> Plin. H. N. L. VI. c. 30. "Babylonia . . . libera hodie ac sui juris, Macedonumque moris." Josephus Antiq. XIII. c. 5. n. 11. *καὶ γὰρ οἱ ταύτῃ κατοικοῦντες Ἕλληνες καὶ Μακεδόνες. κ. τ. λ.*

<sup>4</sup> Dio Cass. L. XL. p. 126. Ed. Wechel. *Ὁ Κράσσος τὰ τε φοινίκια καὶ τὰς πόλεις τὰς Ἑλληνίδας μάλιστα, τὰς τε ἄλλας καὶ τὸ Νικηφόριον ὀνομασμένον προσεποιήσατο.*

<sup>5</sup> Dio L. XXXVII. p. 31. *Καρρῆαί, Μακεδόνων τε ἄποικοι ὄντες.*

<sup>6</sup> Appian. De Reb. Syriac. c. LVII. T. I. p. 622, 23. Ed. Schweigh.

<sup>7</sup> Strabo L. XI. near the end.

<sup>8</sup> Rob. Wood, in "The Ruins of Palmyra, otherwise Tadmor in the desert," (London, 1753. fol.) cites 26 Greek inscriptions and only 13 Palmyrene. Corn. le Brun, also, in "Voyage au Levant," (Paris, 1714.) gives the Greek inscriptions from the original English account, p. 345—66.

<sup>9</sup> Barthelemy, "Reflexions sur l' alphabet et sur la langue, dont on se servoit autrefois à Palmyre," in the "Memoires de l' Academie des Inscript. et Belles Lettres." T. XLV. 8vo. p. 179 seq.

<sup>10</sup> Jos. Antiq. L. XII. c. 3. Bell. Jud. L. VII. c. 3. n. 3.

<sup>11</sup> Cicero pro Archia poeta, c. 3. Archias was born at Antioch, "loco nobili, celebri quondam urbe et copiosâ, atque eruditissimis hominibus, liberalissimisque studiis affluent," &c.

<sup>12</sup> Jos. Ant. L. XII. c. 3. *Καὶ γὰρ Σέλευκος ὁ Νικάτωρ, ἐν αἷς ἔκτισε πόλιν ἐν τῇ Ἀσίᾳ καὶ τῇ κάτω Συρίᾳ . . . τοῖς ἐνοικοιθεῖσιν ἰσοτίμους ἀπέδειξε Μακεδόνας καὶ Ἕλληνας . . . τοὺς Ἰουδαίους.*

Even still more ancient cities, such as Tyre and Sidon, which were treated differently and were more independent on account of their importance, yielded to Greek influence and changed their language. When the rulers of the Roman empire had established their supremacy in these countries, they ordered the edicts which they issued at Tyre to be posted in the public places in two languages, the Latin and the Greek, so that all could read them<sup>1</sup>. The case was the same at Sidon; it was necessary that a Roman edict should be published in the Greek and Latin languages.<sup>2</sup> A general order to the cities of Sidon, Tyre and Ascalon, contains the same clause: This order is to be put up in the temples in Latin and Greek.<sup>3</sup> In these edicts, as was natural, reference was had both to the language of the lawgiver and that of those who were to obey. As to Sidon, there is preserved on a marble a decree of the city, worded in the Greek language, which was past about 144—47 years B. C., in honor of the commander of the body-guard of Ptolemy Philometor.<sup>4</sup> Ascalon is particularly deserving of our notice, as, being situated in Palestine, it was at different periods a component part of the Jewish state. At this time it produced men distinguished in Greek science, as philosophers, historians, and grammarians.<sup>5</sup> Such was the fortune of the principal cities.

A relic of ancient Berytus attests the same respecting that city. East of the present site there still remains the colonnade of a temple which was served by Greek priests, who were mendicants; for there were such even in Pagan antiquity. The following pretty inscription solicited the charity of visitors: *Τῆς τοῦ προσιόντος ἀνδρὸς εὐνοίας αἰεὶ σαφὲς ἐλεγχος ἢ πρόσσωπις γίνεται· δίδου προθύμως ὃ παρέχεις, ἢ μὴ δίδου· παρὰ γὰρ τὸ μικρὸν γίνεται πληρὴς χάρις*. It is impossible to determine its date with precision, but the form of the Σ, as it is represented, refers it at least to the first century.<sup>6</sup>

The heights of Lebanon yet contain ancient structures with Greek inscriptions. One of them is dedicated to the Emperor Tiberius: *ΑΥΤΟΚΡΑΤΟΡΙ ΤΙΒΕΡΙΩΙ ΚΛΑΥΔΙΩΙ ΚΑΙΣΑΡΙ ΣΕΒΑΣΤΩΙ ΚΑΙ &c.*<sup>7</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Jos. Ant. L. XIV. c. 12. n. 5. "Ἐν αὐτὸ (διάταγμα) εἰς τὰς δημοσίας ἐντάξῃτε δέλτους γραμμασι Ῥωμαίοις καὶ Ἑλληνικοῖς, ἐν τῷ ἐπιφανεστάτῳ ἔχητε αὐτὸ γεγραμμένον, ὅπως ὑπὸ πάντων ἀναγινώσκεσθαι δυνήσεται.

<sup>2</sup> Jos. Ant. L. XVI. c. 10. n. 2. Βούλομαι δὲ καὶ Ἑλληνιστὶ καὶ Ῥωμαῖστὶ ἐν δέλτῳ χαλκῇ τοῦτο ἀνατεθῆναι.

<sup>3</sup> Jos. Ant. L. XIV. c. 10. n. 3.

<sup>4</sup> "Voyage du Paul Lucas dans la Grèce, l'Asie mineure, et l'Afrique." T. II. (The 2d Voyage). The decree of the city is at the end of the 2d Vol. "Inscriptions trouvées a Seide, N. 5." Ptolemy Philometor married Cleopatra, his sister, banished Demetrius Soter and Alexander from the kingdom of Syria, and then assumed the crown of Egypt and Syria: (I. Maccab. XI. 8—13.) The inscription I read thus: *Ἡ πόλις Ἀρίαν Λαμοθέτου, Κρηῖτα, τὸν ἀρμισματοφύλακα, καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς πόλεως ἀρετῆς ἔνεκεν, καὶ εὐνοίας τῆς εἰς βασιλέα Πτολεμαῖον καὶ βασίλισσαν Κλεοπάτραν, τὴν ἀδελφὴν, θεοῦς Φιλομήτορας, καὶ τέκνα αὐτῶν, καὶ τῆς εἰς αὐτὴν εὐεργεσίας.*

<sup>5</sup> Stephanus De Urbibus. V. *Ασκάλων*.

<sup>6</sup> Maundrell, 18th March.

<sup>7</sup> Otto Friedr. v. Richter, "Wallfahrten im Morgenlande," 1822. p. 103, at Kalaat Fakra.

The Jews did indeed, when they were oppressed beyond endurance by Antiochus Epiphanes, maintain themselves in the interior of the country with arms in their hands, through the valor of their Asmonæan leaders, uninfluenced by the language and manners of the Greeks; but many cities, which had been torn by the Syrian kings from the Jewish state and had meanwhile been peopled by them with other inhabitants, they were unable to retake.

This glory was left for Aristobulus and Alexander, the first of the Asmonæans who assumed the royal dignity. At the death of the latter they were all, together with several others, subjected to the Jewish sway, or, in case the inhabitants would not embrace Judaism, destroyed.<sup>1</sup> This state of things, however, did not continue long.

When Pompey, returning from his expedition against Mithridates, led his legions through Syria, he took advantage of the disputes between the Jewish princes, to render Palestine dependent on the Romans. On this occasion he took away again from the Jews the cities which they had recovered from the Syrian kings, and ordered those which had been destroyed to be rebuilt, and the latter as well as the former to be restored to their previous inhabitants. Such were Gadara, Hippos, Scythopolis, Pella, Dios, Samaria, Marissa, Azotus, Jamnia, Arethusa, Gaza, Joppa, Dora, and Strato's Tower.<sup>2</sup> Accordingly Samaria, Azotus, Scythopolis, Anthedon, Raphia, Dora, Marissa and Gaza were speedily rebuilt.<sup>3</sup> Probably they were all inhabited, if not wholly, at least in part, by Greeks, or Syrians who spoke Greek.

Of some of them we can assert this positively. Dora, once a city of Galilee, afterwards denied the Jews the right of citizenship. Claudius decided the controversy, and adjudged to the Jews an equal right of citizenship with the *Greeks*.<sup>4</sup> Gadara and Hippos, east of Galilee, became completely Greek cities;<sup>5</sup> the former could even boast of men of eminence in Greek science.<sup>6</sup> In the heart of Palestine, between Galilee and Judea, and once belonging to the former, was Bethshan, called by the Greeks Scythopolis.<sup>7</sup> The Greeks who dwelt here, after changing the name of the city, referred its origin to Bacchus, in the times of Greek mythology,<sup>8</sup> and termed themselves on their coins Nysæan-Scythopolitans. They have rendered themselves memorable by

<sup>1</sup> Jos. Ant. XIII. c. 15. n. 4.

<sup>2</sup> Jos. Ant. XIV. c. 4. n. 4.

<sup>3</sup> Jos. Ant. XIV. c. 5. n. 3.

<sup>4</sup> Jos. Ant. XIX. c. 6. n. 3. "Ἐτι μέντοι καὶ συμπολιτεύεσθαι τοῖς Ἕλλησι.

<sup>5</sup> Jos. Ant. XVII. c. 11. n. 4. Γάδαρα καὶ Ἱππος Ἑλληνίδες εἰσὶ πόλεις. Comp. Bell. Jud. L. II. c. 6. n. 3.

<sup>6</sup> Strabo, L. XVI. p. 759. 2d Casaub.

<sup>7</sup> Βαιθσάν occurs without explanation in the Alexandrine version in Joshua 17: 11; but in Judges 1: 27, Βαιθσάν, ἥ ἐστι Σκυθῶν πόλις. The first profane author in whom we find Σκυθῶν πόλιν, is Polybius. (L. V. c. 70. n. 4.)

<sup>8</sup> The fable is in Pliny and Solinus. Liebe (Gotha Numaria, p. 335, 336,) has cited it in illustration of their coins, which are inscribed Νυσαίων τῶν καὶ Σκυθολιτών. Comp. Eckhel, Doct. Num. Vet. P. I. Vol. III. p. 439.

their base treachery towards their Jewish fellow-citizens.<sup>1</sup> On the southern border of Judæa we meet with Gaza, a city of the Greeks.<sup>2</sup>

That Joppa did not continue free from the influence of the Greek language, may be inferred from its fortunes. On account of its situation and the importance of its harbour, the Alexandrian and Syrian kings often took it from the Jews, and kept it in a state of defence by means of their garrisons.<sup>3</sup> In the days of Strabo<sup>4</sup> the Hellenic fable of Andromeda was already transplanted here, in order to procure the importance of antiquity for the place, and to carry it back to times when Judaism did not exist.

Afterwards Herod succeeded, first through the favor of Antony and then of Augustus, in elevating himself to the throne of the Asmonæans. When he saw himself firmly seated upon it, he, and his sons after him, built new cities in honor of the Cæsars, or embellished the old, and introduced into them Greek inhabitants. The greatest and most magnificent was Cæsarea, next to Jerusalem the principal city of the country, and peopled for the most part by Greeks.<sup>5</sup> But after the death of the king, they were so ungrateful as to refuse the Jews a share in the government of the city. Nero subsequently declared, against the Jews, that the Greeks should be masters of the city.<sup>6</sup> It fared worse with the Greeks at Tiberias; under the same monarch, the Jews fell upon their fellow-citizens, the Greeks, and completely overpowered them.<sup>7</sup> So far accident has favored us with the testimonies of history in respect to the cities of the Herods. If the catalogue be not very copious, let it be considered that I have quoted but a single authority, viz. Josephus, who never mentions the Greeks but when some remarkable occurrence requires him to do so.

Respecting other cities, we can only make inferences from circumstances, or from the evidence of numismatics. Cæsarea by Paneas,<sup>8</sup> built by Philip, had temples, theatres, and coins stamped under Augustus, Caius Cæsar, etc. in the Greek language. Coins of other cities may be easily found in Eckhel and Rasche.

Josephus presents us a long catalogue of cities on which the Jews revenged themselves for the cruel treatment which they had experienced

<sup>1</sup> Bell. Jud. L. II. c. 18. n. 3. 4. Vita Josephi c. 6. The Scythopolitans called upon the Jews who dwelt with them to fight in defence of the city against their mutinous countrymen. They took arms and were victorious; but were attacked unawares by the Scythopolitans and slaughtered in requital. The latter were Greeks, as is stated in a long speech in Bell. Jud. L. VII. c. 8. p. 429.

<sup>2</sup> Jos. Ant. L. XVII. c. 11. n. 4. Bell. Jud. L. II. c. 6. n. 3.

<sup>3</sup> Diod. Sic. L. XIX. c. 59. and 93. 1 Maccab. 10: 75. 12: 33, 34. 13: 11. 14: 34. 2 Maccab. 12: 3. Joseph. Ant. L. XIII. c. 9. n. 2. XIV. c. 10. n. 22.

<sup>4</sup> Strabo, L. XVI. p. 759. Also Pliny, Mela, and Solinus.

<sup>5</sup> Bell. Jud. L. III. c. 9. *Καισαρείαν μεγίστην τῆς δὲ Ἰουδαίας πόλιν, καὶ τὸ πλέον ὑφ' Ἑλλήνων ἐνοικοιμένην.* Comp. L. II. c. 13. n. 7.

<sup>6</sup> Bell. Jud. L. II. c. 14. n. 4. *Καὶ οἱ Καισαρέων Ἕλληνες, νικῆσαντες παρὰ Νέρωνι τῆς πόλεως ἄρχειν.*

<sup>7</sup> Vita Josephi c. 12, where it is said that the inhabitants slew πάντας τοῖς ἐνοικοῦντας Ἕλληνας.

<sup>8</sup> The cavern in which the Jordan rises is called *Πανεῖον*, Pan's cavern, for it was dedicated to Pan and the nymphs, as is shown by the Greek inscriptions on



at the hands of the Greeks in Cæsarea.<sup>1</sup> It is natural to suppose they were Greek cities which were to atone for the offences of the Greeks in Cæsarea. Among them are some which we have just named as Greek cities: Gadara, Hippos, Scythopolis, Askalon, Gaza; and hence we see clearly what kind of cities are intended. True, in this passage the historian does not call the inhabitants of Cæsarea Greeks, as elsewhere, but Syrians; and the cities, Syrian cities. The explanation of this is, that Josephus carefully distinguishes, in further Syria,<sup>2</sup> the Greeks and the Syrians, while, on the contrary, in *hither* Syria, he uses *Ἕλληνας* and *Σύρους* interchangeably as synonymous terms, as if here no distinction prevailed between Greek and Syrian.<sup>3</sup>

The cities which he names are the following. Beyond the Jordan eastward, Philadelphia, Gerasa, Pella, Gadara, Hippos; on this side of the Jordan, Scythopolis; Kedasa, on the boundary between the Tyrian and Galilæan districts; along the sea-coast, Ptolemais, Gaba, Cæsarea, Askalon, Gaza, Anthedon; in the interior, Sebaste. The first six are cities of Decapolis. Here we are assisted by recent discoveries. Philadelphia is still splendid in its ruins, in the remains of its temples and other works of Grecian architecture. Its theatre is the largest in Syria. Gerasa surpasses this city, if not in magnificence, yet in the preservation of its edifices; of temples and palaces, mostly of the Corinthian order, two theatres, *naumachiæ* and baths. All its ruins give evidence of Grecian manners, as do also the fragments of inscriptions occurring in that language.<sup>4</sup>

The case is the same as to the provinces of *Auranitis* and *Trachonitis*, which at the time of our Savior were under Jewish rulers, Herod and his son Philip. The traveller often meets with deserted cities, and in most places dilapidated structures of ancient art, Greek inscriptions on temples, palaces, gates, water-works, and sepulchres. Those the date of which can be determined, belong to the time of Trajan, or of Hadrian and the Antonines. Those of the latter date are most numerous.<sup>5</sup>

the rocks without. Seetzen in Zach's Monathl. Corresp. Octob. 1808. p. 343. Burckhardt, Travels in Syria, Journal of a tour from Damascus in the countries of the Libanus and Antilibanus, p. 39.

<sup>1</sup> Jos. Bell. Jud. L. II. c. 18.

<sup>2</sup> Jos. Antiq. L. XVIII. c. 9. n. 8. and 9.

<sup>3</sup> Bell. Jud. L. II. c. 13. n. 7. Comp. with c. 14. n. 4. Vita Josephi c. 11. Antiq. L. XVII. c. 5. n. 7. Histoire de l'Academie des Inscript. et Bell. Lettres, T. II. p. 170, 171, in 8vo.

<sup>4</sup> The inscription on a broken column of a public edifice at Gerasa, very inaccurately copied in Buckingham's "Travels in Palestine," Ch. XXI. p. 378, I should correct in part, at least, thus: ἐπὶ . . . τοῦ μεγαλοπρεπεστάτου . . . καὶ ἄρχοντος ἐγένετο τὸ ἔργον τοῦ ἐμβύλου. Another at Suf. distant an hour and a half from Gerasa, I read thus: Ἀγαθῇ τύχῃ . . . Αὐτῷ ἁγίον καὶ ἐθνίῳ ἡρωϊ, καὶ ἡλίῳ, ἀμέραι, ἡοῦ, Δημετρίῳ παιδανίον . . . Ἀγρίος ἀπελεύθερος τὸν βωμὸν ἀνέθηκεν κατ' εὐχὴν Ἀνδρῶντι . . .

<sup>5</sup> Seetzen collected 69 inscriptions, and among them only one in Palmyrene characters, the rest in Greek. Unfortunately they were all lost. Zach "Monathl. Correspond." May 1806. p. 313. Those procured by Burckhardt are well known. "Journal of an excursion into the Haouran in 1810," and "Journal of a tour from Damascus into the Haouran in 1812," in his "Travels in Syria." Some which escaped Burckhardt may be found in Otto Fried. von Richter's "Wallfahrten im Morgenlande," p. 554—562.

These are, indeed, later than the times of the Apostles; but a country does not change its language in from twenty to fifty years; and such a prevalence of Hellenism can be accounted for only by supposing that the Greeks had been settled here for several generations.

The names Auranitis and Trachonitis remind us of *Abilene*, the tetrarchate of Lysanias. On an eminence between Damascus and Baalbec, called Nebi-Abel, stands a Doric temple. Within is a metrical inscription in Greek, which declares the fame of the architect, the name of the foundress, and the year of the government of *Lysanias*, *tetrarch of Abilene*, and serves to determine the date of its erection.<sup>1</sup>

According to these appearances, the eastern portion of the country formerly in the possession of the Israelites was sprinkled over on the north with Greek villages and cities, and on the south was mostly occupied by free cities of a Greek character, surrounded by their territories, Philadelphene, Gerasene, Gadarithis, Hippene, which were under Roman protection. On the opposite side, a chain of cities extended from Antioch downward, along the Syrian, Phœnician, and Jewish coast, as far as the Egyptian frontier, in which Greek, if not the sole, was the prevailing language. The country between these two sides, comprising the districts of Galilee and Judea, in spite of its desire to the contrary, was never able to avoid coming in contact with the Greeks and with their language; so much the less, as under Herod several cities on the coast, Joppa, Askalon, Gaza, Anthedon, and Cæsarea always, belonged to the Jewish territory; and in the interior, besides Scythopolis, there arose important cities, as Sebaste, Tiberias, Cæsarea by Panias, which were inhabited more or less by those who spoke Greek. True, the Greeks did not succeed in supplanting the native tongue; but it maintained a respectable rank by its side, and, favored by the circumstances of the period, gradually extended and established its dominion.

From the time of Pompey, the opposition to the inroads of the Greeks into the interior was suppressed. Not only were the barriers broken down, but the Greeks were even the favored party. They became still more so under Herod the first, who did not conceal from the Jews that he gave the preference to the Greeks.<sup>2</sup> Nor did he stop with this confession, but by costly establishments evinced that it was his purpose to Hellenize the Jews.

He erected at Cæsarea a theatre and an amphitheatre;<sup>3</sup> at Jericho a stadium, amphitheatre and theatre;<sup>4</sup> a stadium and amphitheatre under the walls of the Holy City, and finally a theatre within its very limits.<sup>5</sup> The enormous appropriations for this species of edifices, particularly in the interior of the country, at Jericho, and even at Jerusalem, shows

<sup>1</sup> Pococke, Descript. of the East. Vol II. Chap. 7. § 177.

<sup>2</sup> "Ἑλλησι πλείον ἢ Ἰουδαίοις οἰκείως ἔχειν ὁμολογοῦμενος. Jos. Ant. XIX. c. 7. n. 3.

<sup>3</sup> Jos. Ant. XV. c. 9. p. 773. Comp. XVI. c. 5.

<sup>4</sup> Bell. Jud. L. I. c. 33. n. 6. 8. p. 141. 2. Antiq. XVII. c. 6. n. 5. L. XVII. c. 6. n. 3. p. 844.

<sup>5</sup> Bell. Jud. L. II. c. 3. n. 1. Antiq. XV. c. 8. p. 766. Θέατρον ἐν Ἱερουσολύμοις ὠκοδόμησε. Comp. Eichhorn, De Judæorum re scenicâ. Comment. Soc. R. Scient. Götting. Recentior. Vol. II. Class. Antiq. p. 10—13.

how determined he was to accustom the Jews to the Greek drama and to the sanguinary diversions of the Romans.

It is worthy of inquiry, to what degree the subsequent Roman government, administered by the procurators and prætors of Syria, (the former under the control of the latter,) contributed to, or retarded the adoption of the Greek language. This inquiry may be proposed as follows: What language did the prætors of Syria and the governors of Judea, Vitellius, Petronius, Pilate, use when sitting in judgment or addressing the assembled people?

Formerly it had been customary for the Roman governors to speak only their own language; and this even where it was not understood, as in Greece and Asia. In the reign of Tiberius, however, the ancient custom was so far laid aside, that, as a contemporary declares, the place in which the senate assembled at Rome resounded even to deafening with Greek debates.<sup>1</sup> Where formerly the ambassadors of the Greeks were heard only through the medium of an interpreter, and their requests answered in the same way,<sup>2</sup> a Roman emperor now harangued them at length in the Greek language.<sup>3</sup>

When they sat in judgment, they frequently dispensed Roman law in Greek words. Tiberius having made an exception in this matter, and refused to receive the testimony of a centurion in the Greek language, the historian observes that the emperor was not consistent in this; for in the same court he had conducted many examinations and had pronounced many decisions, in this language. The judgments of Claudius were often interspersed with verses of Homer,<sup>4</sup> and he was frequently annoyed by the impudence of the Greeks.<sup>5</sup> When Nero first engaged in public affairs, he spoke in behalf of the Bononians, and in behalf of the Rhodians and Ilienses, before the Consul; for the first in Latin, and for the others in Greek.<sup>6</sup>

If the emperors themselves in Rome administered justice to the inhabitants of the provinces in the Greek language, and the affairs of the Greeks, which were brought forward by their ambassadors, were discussed in Greek in the senate and before the Consuls, we may easily infer what was the procedure of the Romans in Greece and Asia.

We are not without examples on this point. Cicero spoke in a Greek senate at Syracuse in the Greek language, as Verres reproached him.<sup>7</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Valer. Max. L. II. c. 2. n. 3.

<sup>2</sup> Aul. Gell. Noct. Att. L. VII. c. 14.

<sup>3</sup> Sueton. Claudius, c. 42. He made a single exception in respect to ambassadors who were of Roman extraction and had settled in the provinces. To them he spoke in Latin and required a reply in Latin. Dio Cass. L. LX. p. 676. ed. Wechel. 1606. Sueton. Claud. c. 16.

<sup>4</sup> Dio Cass. L. LVII. p. 612. Wechel. and Rob. Steph. p. 419. Suetonius limits it only thus much: *Sermone Græco . . . non tamen usquequaque usus est. Abstinit maxime in senatu.* Tiber. c. 71. Whenever he made use of the Latin language he took pains to speak and write it with purity. Dio L. LVII. p. 613. Wech. and Rob. Steph. p. 420. Comp. Sueton. De illustr. grammat. c. 22.

<sup>5</sup> Sueton. Claud. c. 42.

<sup>6</sup> Sueton. Claud. c. 15.

<sup>7</sup> Sueton. Nero. c. 7. Comp. Seneca, Controv. L. IV. p. 291. Bipont.

<sup>8</sup> Cicero, in Verrem L. IV. c. 66.

Yet it is not probable that he would have done any thing in his capacity of ambassador which he could not justify by other facts. P. Crassus, who, as proconsul, was commissioned to make war against Aristonicus in Asia, went so far as to make replies and issue commands to each of the Grecian tribes in its own dialect, according as he was addressed; to the Ionians in Ionic, to the Æolians in Æolic.<sup>1</sup> Augustus, as conqueror and sovereign, addressed the people of Alexandria in Greek.<sup>2</sup> By Greek eloquence Mucianus induced the people of Antioch to declare for Vespasian.<sup>3</sup> The Greek even seems to have been the court language of the proconsuls in Asia and Syria.<sup>4</sup>

Once more then: What language was used by the procurators of Palestine, Pilate, Porcius Festus, when they sat in judgment? and by the prætors of Syria, Petronius, Vitellius, when, as often happened, they addressed the people? That the Romans in Syria and Phœnicia made use of the Greek language, we know from the preceding evidence; and that an interpreter was employed by them in Palestine, we find no evidence either in Josephus or the sacred books.

As respects the people, the higher classes could hardly do without this language on account of the change in the circumstances of society; but with the multitude, the knowledge of it depended on accident, the sphere of life in which each was placed, and his employment. "Few of my countrymen," says Josephus, at the end of his *Archæology*, "could have composed this work in the Greek language, for want of a grammatical acquaintance with it; in which I can boast myself superior to others, although, from the established customs of my country, I myself do not speak it well. For among us the knowledge of foreign languages, and nicety and elegance in pronouncing them, are considered vulgar, inasmuch as freemen of low condition and even menials may, if they please, acquire them. We consider those only learned who are skilled in our law and can expound the sacred books."

A knowledge of the ancient language and the religious documents, was therefore the object of the higher Jewish education. There were even no places of instruction for the existing popular dialect, the Aramæan. The Greek was neglected in the same manner. The Jews understood it, but not grammatically. They learned it by conversation and intercourse; and in this way it was acquired by the lower orders, who were not in a situation to receive instruction, had it been provided.

The religious authorities were so far from being any longer opposed to the diffusion of the Greek language, that they esteemed and revered it above every other language. Writings composed in it were reckoned among the works of Jewish learning; and its use was allowed even in judicial cases in which religion was concerned. So we are informed by the oldest and most to be relied on of the Talmudic records, viz. the Mishna; for I am not inclined to regard all the dreams of the later Jews.

"The Jews are not permitted to compose books in all languages;

<sup>1</sup> Valer. Max. L. VII. c. 7. n. 6.

<sup>2</sup> Dio. Cass. L. LI. p. 454. Wech. and R. Steph. p. 307.

<sup>3</sup> Tacit. Hist. L. II. c. 80.

<sup>4</sup> Seneca, Ep. XII. De ira, L. II. c. 5.



they shall only be allowed to *write them in the Greek language*." This is a declaration of Rabbi Simeon, the son of Gamaliel, which was regarded as a statute.<sup>1</sup>

A bill of divorce might be either in *Greek* or *Hebrew* (if desired, in both languages), and signed by the witnesses in *Greek* or *Hebrew*. It was equally valid, whichever language was used.<sup>2</sup> Yet in this matter the Jews were extremely scrupulous, and allowed absolutely no interference in it on the part of any court not Jewish. They likewise would not regard any witness as competent in such a case, unless he were of their own nation.<sup>3</sup> So indulgent had they become in a legal matter pertaining to religious or Mosaic casuistry.

The earliest prohibition of the Greek occurred in the later days of the Jewish state, when Titus distressed Jerusalem. In the war of Vespasian the bridegroom's wreath and the cymbals were abolished by a public edict; and in the war of Titus the use of the bride's wreath was prohibited, and fathers were forbidden henceforth to permit their sons to learn Greek.<sup>4</sup>

From this prohibition we might explain, were it necessary, why Josephus, when deputed by Titus to persuade the besieged to less desperate measures, addressed them in their native language, *τῇ πατρίῳ γλώσσῃ* and *Ἑβραϊζῶν*. (*Bell. Jud. L. V. c. 9. n. 2. L. VI. c. 2. n. 1.*) But even had there been no such prohibition, there was in the old ancestral sounds an evidence of like extraction and like interest in the fate of the country, and hence an inducement to confidence. So Titus thought;<sup>5</sup> and how then can it be considered as proof of ignorance of the Greek on the part of the besieged?

I must mention another circumstance. When the revolvers, in the last decisive moments, became apparently somewhat more submissive, they requested a conference with Titus. He had never yet appeared in person in any negotiation. He approached, ordered a cessation of hostilities on the part of the Romans, had an interpreter at his side, (*ὄψεσθ ἧν τεκμηρίον τοῦ κρατεῖν*, as Josephus adds,) and himself commenced the conference.<sup>6</sup> Here he spoke through an interpreter. Was this in-

<sup>1</sup> Mischn. Tract. Megill. c. 1. n. 8. רבן שמעון בן גמליאל אומר אם בספרים לא התירו שיכתבו אלא יונית : According to R. B. Maimon and Obadiah of Bartenora, the הלכה or observance was in conformity with R. Simeon's decision. Comp. c. II. n. 1, where the two Rabbins assert it to be indifferent whether the Megillah be read in Chaldee or Greek. Thus the objection of a learned man is removed, who maintains that it would be contrary to established custom for a Jew of Palestine (Matthew) to have written a book in the Greek language. (Berthold, Hist. Einleit. in die Schriften des A. und N. T. III. Th. § 320. p. 1176.) The passage to which he refers (Joseph. Antiq. Præm. n. 2.) relates only to the difficulty he found in expressing himself accurately according to the idiom of a foreign language; for Josephus wished not merely to write Greek, but to write it elegantly. (Ant. L. XVI. at the beginning.)

<sup>2</sup> Mischn. Tr. Gitin. c. 9. n. 8. גט שכתבו עברות ועדין יונית ועדין : עברית עד אחד עברי ועד אחד יוני כתב סופר ועד כשר : Compare with this the preceding sections in the same chapter of Tr. Gitin.

<sup>3</sup> Gitin. c. 1. n. 5.

<sup>4</sup> Misch. in Sotah. c. 9. n. 14. בפלמוס של שיטוס גזרו על עשרות כלות ושלא ילמד אדם את בנו יונית :

<sup>5</sup> *Τάχα ἐνδοῦναι πρὸς ὁμόφυλον δοκῶν αὐτοῦς*. Bell. Jud. L. V. c. 9. n. 2.

<sup>6</sup> Bell. Jud. L. 6. c. 6.

terpreter, then, employed to translate the words of Titus into Hebrew? For that office he would no doubt have preferred Josephus himself. But it was not he: if it had been he would have mentioned it, for he never forgets himself in his history. Neither was the interpreter present to address the Jews in Hebrew, *πατρίῳ γλώσσῃ*; for Josephus would have mentioned it. For what purpose, then, it will be asked, was the interpreter needed? The words of the historian, rightly understood, afford an explanation. The emperor spoke *ex majestate imperii*, i. e. in *Latin*, according to the old Roman custom. Thus much is conveyed by the words: *ὅπερ ἦν τεκμήριον τοῦ κρατεῖν*, *this was the distinguishing mark of sovereignty*, which have been falsely referred to the next clause: *primus, quod victoris indicium, dicere instituit*. It would have been better if Ruffin's translation had been retained, who comes, at least, nearer the mark: "*adhibitoque interprete, quo argumento superior ostendebatur*". Now the interpreter translated his words into a more intelligible language, but, as we have inferred from the usual custom of Josephus, not into the Hebrew. What language, then, could it have been? Moreover, (in confirmation,) Titus is praised for having made use of the *Latin* language in state affairs, and the Greek in his literary recreations.<sup>1</sup>

We now return to our subject. It can no longer be doubted that, at the time when Matthew wrote, the Greek language held firm footing in Palestine. But it is not yet perfectly clear from all these facts united, what was the mutual relation of the two languages. An occurrence in Paul's life promises us some light on this point. At Jerusalem, in an uproar which arose in the temple against him, he was with difficulty carried away to a place of safety by the guard. He demands leave to speak to the assembled people; ascends the stairs and addresses them in the Hebrew tongue. (Acts 21: 40.) This pleased them; and we see in the fact their predilection for the language of the country. The gratification, however, proves at the same time that the people might have been addressed in another language. The narrative of the historian even shows that the assembled multitude expected a speech in another language. "And he beckoned with the hand unto the people. And when there was made a great silence, he spake unto them in the Hebrew tongue, saying, Men, brethren and fathers, hear ye my defence which I make now unto you. And when they heard that he spake in the Hebrew tongue to them, they kept the more silence," *μᾶλλον παρέσχον ἡσυχίαν*. (Acts 21: 40—22: 2.) It is plain from the narrative that they expected an address in another language, and, to their gratification, heard a defence in Hebrew. Now what language were they expecting? The accusation against Paul, and the immediate cause of the uproar, was that he had introduced Greeks into the temple. (Acts 21: 28.) His accusers were Greek Jews from Ionia, who had a short time before seen Trophimus, the Ephesian, with him. (Acts 21: 27—30.) The accusation and the accusers must have led the people to expect only an address in Greek. The case is the more in point as it does not relate to individuals, but to the people who were

<sup>1</sup> Suidas. V. *Τίτος*—τῇ μὲν *Λατίνων ἐπιχορηγίᾳ γλώττῃ* πρὸς τὰς αὐτῶν κοινῶν ἐχρήτο διοικήσεις, ποιήματα δὲ καὶ τραγωδίας Ἑλλάδι φωνῇ διεπονέτο.

his auditors, and the whole city which was in commotion. To judge from this occurrence, the language of the country had the predilection of the people in its favor; the mass, however, though there may have been thousands and thousands of exceptions, understood Greek likewise, more from circumstances than from an inclination to foreign languages and manners. But it was on a feast-day; a great number of foreigners were present. True; and yet the greater number were natives who would have understood Greek, but were glad to hear the *Hebrew* instead of it.

It may now appear less surprising that even in the capital, the central point of Judaism, there were peculiar synagogues, in which the Greeks of various countries convened in separate congregations of considerable magnitude; e. g. the Alexandrians, Cyrenians, Asiatics, &c. (Acts 6: 9. 9: 29.)

The Christian sect, too, of this city consisted partly of persons who spoke Greek, or Hellenists, who were sufficiently numerous to maintain a dispute with the Jews. (Acts 6: 1 seq.)

We are here drawn into a controversy, which for the sake of completeness we must not avoid. Some have been desirous of getting rid of these Jews who spoke Greek, and Jewish Christians, who are mentioned in the Acts. In order to get rid of them, we have been referred to an explanation which had been long ago abandoned, and is to the following purport: "Hellenists were only proselytes, who were always somewhat despised by the Jews who belonged to the twelve tribes, or Hebrews in the strict sense of the word, and were denominated Hellenists, in reference to their heathen extraction."<sup>1</sup>

At any rate, however, they spoke Greek; the rather as they were of heathen extraction, or but lately heathen themselves. Who could expect any thing else from natives of Cilicia, and particularly of Cyrene, Alexandria, and Ionia? (Acts 6: 9.) The example of Philo may be adduced to prove that the Alexandrians understood also something of Hebrew: but this must have been trifling; and besides, there were very few so learned as he was.

Let us enter into a little analysis. What was a Jew? What a Hebrew? What was a Hellene? and what a Hellenist?—The name of Jew (we speak of the times of our Lord and the Apostles,) was the common expression for all who derived their origin from the ancient kingdom of Judah, in whatever part of the world they might dwell; (*αἰσὶ Ἰουδαῖοι*, Gal. 2: 15. *πάντες κατὰ τὴν οἰκουμένην*, Acts. 24: 5,) and the religion of this race of men (*γένος*) is called Judaism (*Ἰουδαϊσμός*) Galat. 1: 14. Hence the Jews stand opposed to the heathen (*ἔθνη*) Rom. 3: 29. 9: 24, &c. &c., or to the principal heathen nation, the Greeks (*Ἕλληνες*,) Acts 18: 4. Rom. 2: 9. 10: 12. 1 Cor. 1: 24. To be addicted to Judaism is *Ἰουδαΐζειν*; a pagan mode of life, however, is *ἔθνικῶς ζῆν* (Gal. 2: 14,) and never *Ἑλληνίζειν*. He who had been converted from heathenism, but not so long since as to be con-

<sup>1</sup> Dr. Pfannkuche, On the Language of Palestine in the time of Christ and the Apostles, according to De Rossi. In Eichhorn's Allgem. Biblioth. der bibl. Literatur, Vol. VIII. Part. 3. p. 472.



sidered a citizen, was a proselyte, or son of a proselyte. (Acts. 6: 5. 13: 43.) In Acts 2: 10, the terms *Ἰουδαῖοι* and *προσέλυτοι* comprise all the adherents of Judaism.

Now in Acts 6: 1 the Hebrews and Hellenists stand opposed to each other in the same way as the Jews and Hellenes. What can it have been which distinguished the Hebrew, and by virtue of which he constituted a subdivision of the general term Jew? Certainly not religion; in that he was a Jew: not his extraction; in that also he was a Jew. What, then, can it have been but language? When customs, opinions, and religious worship are spoken of, *Ἰουδαϊκός* only is used; but whenever the national language, alphabet and literature are mentioned, *Ἑβραϊκός* is used; as *Ἑβραϊκή διάλεκτος*, Acts 22: 2. 26: 14. *Ἑβραϊκά γράμματα*, Luke 23: 38; and persons speak and write *Ἑβραῖσι*, John 19: 17, 20.<sup>1</sup> But we never find *Ἰουδαϊκή διάλεκτος*, *Ἰουδαϊκά γράμματα*, etc. It is thus pretty clear in what the Hebrew was distinguished from the mass of his nation.

If then the peculiarity by which the Hebrew distinguished himself consisted in language, it may be inferred what was the peculiar characteristic of the Hellenist, who is opposed to him; that likewise must have related to language. Hence *Ἑβραΐζειν* and *Ἑλληνίζειν* were opposed to each other. The word *Ἑβραΐζειν* signifies in Josephus, *to express any thing in Hebrew*: *τὰ τοῦ Καίσαρος διηγγέιλε Ἑβραΐζων*. (*Bell. Jud. L. VI. c. 3. n. 1.*) What then must *Ἑλληνίζειν* have been? What it always was, *to speak Greek*; as, e. g. Thucydides says, (II. 48,) *Ἑλληνίσθησαν τὴν νῦν γλῶσσαν, they adopted the Greek language which they now speak*; and Xenophon, (*Anab. VII. c. 3. n. 12.*) *Ἑλληνίζειν γὰρ ἡμίσταντο*; or as Lucian, (*Philopseud. c. 16.*) says of the *dæmon* which the native of Palestine expels, *ἀποκρίνεται Ἑλληνίζων ἢ βαρβαρίζων* that he replied in both languages of Palestine, in the language of the country, *βαρβαρίζων*, and in the Greek, *Ἑλληνίζων*. Hence a Hellenist was very well defined by the Scholiast to be *a Jew by extraction who speaks Greek*;<sup>2</sup> and if John Chrysostom derived this meaning, as I suppose he did, from the mere formation of the word, he was too good a Grecian for us on this account to dispute his assertion.<sup>3</sup> If we consult one of the old Greek grammarians, we obtain from him the following information: from *Ἑλλην* comes *Ἑλληνίζω*, then *Ἑλληνιστί*; as from *Ἀιορίζω*, *Ἀιοριστί*, *Ἀιολίζω*, *Ἀιολιστί*. This plainly refers to language and dialect.<sup>4</sup> Thus Hellenists were distinguished by their language, in respect to which they stood opposed to Jews speaking Hebrew or Aramæan. They were men who spoke Greek.

Too great an importance is attached, notwithstanding, (particularly by Bertholdt) to the fact that Jesus is represented as speaking Hebrew. (Mark 5: 41, *ταλιθα κουμι*; 7: 34, *εἰσφραθά*; and Matth. 27: 46, Mark

<sup>1</sup> Joseph. de Maccab. § 14. The mother exhorts her sons *Ἑβραϊκῇ φωνῇ* and *τῇ Ἑβραϊδὶ διαλέκτῳ*.

<sup>2</sup> Schol. in Act. Ap. VI. 1. Edit. N. T. Frid. Matthæi. *Ἑλληνιστῶν—τῶν Ἑλληνιστῶν φθεγγομένων, καίτοι Ἑβραίων ὄντων τῷ γένει*.

<sup>3</sup> J. Chrys. Comment. in Act. VI. 1—9. *Ἑλληνιστὰς δὲ οἶμαι καλεῖν τοὺς Ἑλληνιστῶν φθεγγομένους, οὗτοι γὰρ Ἑλληνιστῶν διελέγοντο Ἑβραῖοι ὄντες*.

<sup>4</sup> Apollon. Alexandrin. in Imman. Bekkeri Anecd. Græc. Vol. II. p. 572.



15: 34.) It might be replied that the Hebrew words in these passages are quoted by the Evangelists as something remarkable, which would not have been the case had Jesus usually spoken Hebrew; and what could reasonably be objected to this answer? But we will not dismiss the matter so hastily. Our Lord may have addressed the Jewish multitude in Hebrew, on account of their predilection for it. But how did he address a mixed assembly collected from different countries and cities? How did he address proselytes and pagans; e. g. at Gadaris? (Matth. 8: 28 seq. Mark 5: 1. Luke 8: 26.) What language did he speak in the region of Tyre and Sidon (Mark 7: 24 seq.), where the Syrophenician Greek woman (*γυνή Ἑλληνὶς Συροφονικήτισσα*,) entered into conversation with him? and what in Decapolis, which consisted of Greek cities, such as Philadelphia, Gerasa, Gadara, Hippos, and Pella?

Finally, even if Jesus did frequently speak Hebrew, how can that affect Matthew, who was not obliged to address distinct collections of people constantly changing, sometimes Hebrews, sometimes Hellenists, and hence allowed to vary his language accordingly; but must have had in mind a fixed class of men, and have adapted his language to that class, in which were included not only the present but a future race, to whom perhaps the Hebrew might become less familiar?

Let us now recapitulate the observations we have made.

I. Through the supremacy of the Macedonians, Asia was filled far and wide with Greek cities. In hither Asia many were founded by the dynasty of the Ptolemies, and especially by that of the Seleucidæ. Older cities, such as Tyre and Sidon, under the same influence changed their language.

II. The Syrian, Phœnician and Jewish coast throughout, to the borders of Egypt, was occupied by cities either entirely or half Greek. The Israelitish east, from the Arnon upwards, to Dead, Bashan, Hauran, Trachonitis including Abilene, was entirely Greek towards the north, and towards the south mostly in possession of the Greeks. In Judea and Galilee there were several cities wholly, or at least in a great measure, inhabited by Greeks.

III. Herod the great expended enormous sums to transform his Jews into Greeks.

IV. The Roman supremacy rather promoted than impeded this progress to Hellenism.

V. Even the religious authorities of the Jews were so far from making any opposition, that they paid respect to the Greek language till the latest period of the state, and acknowledged it as proper to be employed in their literary works, and even admissible in judicial transactions.

VI. Thus favored on every side, this language spread itself by means of intercourse and conversation through all classes, so that the people in general, though with many exceptions, understood it, being however more attached to their own language.

VII. In the Holy City itself there were congregations exclusively composed of Jews who spoke Greek. From these and from Greek proselytes the Christian sect in Jerusalem was partly supplied with adherents.

1. Let us imagine Matthew placed in these circumstances. If he

wrote in Greek, the mass of the people understood him, and he was compensated for that part of the people who perhaps spoke only the language of the country, by the cities on the borders or in the interior which from early times or through the favor of the Herods were inhabited either entirely or partially by Greeks; as likewise by the Hellenistic congregations in the Holy City and the Hellenists among the Christians, with whom he could communicate in no other way. If he wrote in Hebrew, he resigned the greater and perhaps the nobler part of the readers we have just mentioned.

2. If he took into consideration Auranitis, Trachonitis, or the other eastern districts, once the inheritance of the Israelites, now chiefly belonging to the cities of Decapolis, he found weighty reason for a preference of the Greek.

3. If his view likewise comprehended the adjacent regions of the west; if he considered Antioch the capital of Syria, where the believers were first called Christians (Acts 11: 26); or neighboring Syrian churches (Acts 15: 23, 41); if he thought of Tyre, where there were already Christians (Acts 21: 3, 4); of Sidon (Acts 28: 3); and other cities along the Phœnician coast (for they all fall within the sphere of operation which he assigned himself in the composition of his book, § 2; they all had an evident acquaintance with Palestine and its inhabitants); he could no longer be undecided to which language he should give the preference; he could not but select the Greek.

4. If, writing his book at that late period of the national existence, his mind was wholly engrossed by the prophecies of his Master, which led him to expect a speedy dissolution of the Jewish state, (of the prelude to which he was already himself an eyewitness,) and if he desired to have an influence even after that dissolution was completed; if he wished to be understood still, when the remnant of the Jews, wandering and homeless in their own country, without a temple or religious worship, should have surrendered their possessions to others; if he intended to write not merely for a few months or years; then he would by no means have written the language of a nation which in a short time would cease to be a nation.

## § 11.

Such having been the condition of the national language of Palestine, it cannot be doubted, that besides the Nazarenes and the few natives of the country who passionately clung to the usages and language of their nation, a multitude of other Jewish adherents to Christianity, scattered in various parts of Palestine, must have read and understood any Hebrew original of Matthew, if there were such an one, and would hardly have exchanged it for a Greek version. On this account copies of the text must have multiplied, and must have spread into various parts of the country; and these copies could not have been so completely destroyed that not a trace should remain of them, except, as is pretended, among the sect of the Nazarenes or Ebionites.

In Syria, likewise, particularly in the northeast part of it, where the Syriac dialect obstinately maintained itself, and where even in the 2d century sprang up a Syriac literature and school of poetry, a book of

this kind, written in the Galilean dialect, could not but be acceptable for use in private by individuals, as well as in public religious service. It would have been no objection that it was in Hebrew characters, for, judging from the Palmyrene inscriptions, these were the common characters in a large part of Syria, and where they were not so, a change of the letters would do away all difficulty. Christians in this country could never have lost sight of it, as their only religious book until they obtained a version of the whole New Testament; and yet, when this version was prepared, they were so little aware of such an original Gospel, that instead of preserving that as a venerable original document, or altering it so as to adapt it more perfectly to their dialect, they translated anew our *Greek text*, itself a translation.

Origen, too, found no trace of such a book; he could discover nothing but the book κατ' Ἑβραίων, the value of which he left to every one's own decision; and yet the discovery of Matthew in its original language was as important to him as his perseverance in such investigations was untiring. He not only devoted time and labor to the Old Testament, in order to restore the purity of the Septuagint by reference to the original text and other critical helps, but was employed, likewise, in a Recension of the New Testament. The many errors that had crept into the book of Matthew, of which he expressly complains, could be remedied in no surer way than by recurrence, as in respect to the Old Testament, to the original text. He performed, during twenty-eight years, numerous journeys for critical purposes, and drew forth many unused and forgotten Mss. from obscurity, in which, but for him, they would probably have perished, for the sake of leaving nothing unattempted for the melioration of the biblical text. He travelled over Palestine and Syria, and lived at Tyre while making use of the critical apparatus he had collected. Notwithstanding these laborious researches made by this intelligent man for this express purpose, he nowhere discovered any such original of Matthew.

Pamphilus, a Phœnician of Barut, celebrated as a martyr, as the instructor of Eusebius, and on account of his biblical scholarship, founded for the church at Cæsarea a library of note among the ancients, and diligently searched everywhere to procure books for it. The treasure of biblical literature which it presented attracted Jerome thither, and he derived great advantage from it. But even for this collection, no Hebrew copy of Matthew had been obtained by Pamphilus; he could procure only the Nazarene book, and it was this which Jerome, who translated it, here saw.<sup>1</sup> So entirely fruitless were the endeavors of the ancients to get a sight of the pretended original text of this Evangelist, that its existence seems to have been mere report, without the slightest foundation in reality.

On the other hand, nothing was known of a translation of Matthew into Greek. Let us examine Papias once more, who pretends, as we have seen, that Matthew wrote in Hebrew, and then subjoins: ἡρμήνευσε δὲ αὐτὰ (Ματθαίου λόγια) ὡς ἡδύνατο ἕκαστος—each one translated the book as well as he could. (*Euseb. H. E. L. III.* at the

<sup>1</sup> Hieronym. de Script. Eccles. V. Pamphil. and V. Matth.; as also L. III. Adv. Pelag. "In Evangelio juxta Hebræos . . . quo utuntur usque hodie Nazarenī . . . quod in Cæsareensi biliothecā habetur," &c.



end.) That is to say, such Christians as did not understand Hebrew translated the book, every man according to his ability ; or, more briefly still, whoever did not understand it, translated it. Or did he imagine that all Christians learned something of Hebrew in order to be able to understand Matthew ? No writer, unless he were entangled in error, could be betrayed into such difficulties. So much, however, is clear from this, that Papias and all those from whom he derived his collection of ancient traditions, did not know when, where, by whom, or on what authority, a Greek version of Matthew had been executed ; and this in the earliest part of the second century, when it could not have been long translated, as Matthew wrote his Gospel at most only sixty years before Papias, and the pretended version must have been considerably later, since he asserts that Christians dispensed with a version for some time.

Let us now compare these facts. Pamphilus and Origen, one of whom lived in Palestine, the other in Phœnicia, were not able to procure the genuine Hebrew Matthew. The Syrians, in whose dialect, by the way, it was written, and who certainly would have obtained it at their conversion, did not know of its existence about the close of the second century. Now where could it have existed if not in Palestine, Phœnicia, or Syria ? On the other hand, at the commencement of the 2d century, nobody had any knowledge of a translation of Matthew into Greek, for the use of those who were not Jews ; exactly as though from the beginning nobody had heard of any other Matthew than a Greek one.

## § 12.

The Gospel of Matthew which is in our possession, and the substance of which belongs to him as its author, according to the testimony of the most various and distinct religious sects of the earliest times of Christianity, as we have shown in our general introduction,—this Gospel was originally written in Greek. For the Greek dress of the passages which are cited from the Old Testament is so managed, that their appearance must be ascribed to the authors, and not to any translator. They generally exhibit his peculiar purposes, and have reference to the practical scope of his history, which he was desirous of making evident as the narrative proceeded.

In general, the Alexandrian version is used and literally followed in these quotations. The author of the Greek text of Matthew, however, had at his command the Hebrew text of the Old Testament, and freely consulted it.

He sometimes deserted the Septuagint and gave his citations a peculiar and happy turn in reference to the purpose of his book, even when no necessity required it, but merely for the sake of making an expression more strictly appropriate. For instance : there was nothing to prevent his making use of Isaiah 42: 1 seq. as it stood in the Septuagint ; but the words: οὐδὲ ἀκουσθήσεται ἡ φωνὴ αὐτοῦ ἔξω, which, it was true, were the literal rendering of וְלֹא-יִשְׁמַע בְּחוּץ קוֹלִי, did not seem to him who determined the Greek phraseology, sufficiently definite and appropriate to delineate the character of an *unassuming sage*, as mani-



fested in Jesus. The purport of the passage was therefore made more suitable to the idea of the Evangelist, by a peculiar phraseology: *He shall not strive nor cry, neither shall any man hear his voice in the streets, οὐκ ἐρίσει οὐδὲ κραυγάσει, οὐδὲ ἀκούσει τις ἐν ταῖς πλατείαις τὴν φωνὴν αὐτοῦ*. In these words were clearly portrayed the quiet, noiseless character, and unassuming modesty of Jesus. (Matt. 12: 19.)

In citing Psalm 78: 2, he might have used the words *σθιγέσομαι προβλήματα ἀπ' ἀρχῆς*; but they were not sufficiently significant of the kind of discourse which established the Messianic authority of Jesus, for proof of which, principally, Matthew cited the Old Testament. For with the Jews the plan of the Messiah's advent to bless them was a deep mystery of the Godhead from eternity, *προεγνωσμένα ἀπὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου*. (1 Pet. 1: 20. Ephes. 1: 4. Heb. 9: 26.) To express this, *ἀπ' ἀρχῆς* was too tame, and a more lively idea was contained in the word *מֵרִאשִׁית*; he therefore gave more force and consequence to the passage by using the best expression: *ἐρεῦξομαι κεκρυμμένα ἀπὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου*. (Matt. 13: 35.)

The translation of the words *חֲלִי* and *מְבַאֵשׁ*, in Isaiah 53: 4, by *ἀσθενεῖα* and *νόσος*, (Matt. 8: 17,) was so perfectly adapted to the writer's purpose, that the Hebrew expression was far transcended with the view of promoting the aim of the Evangelist.<sup>1</sup>

The words in Matt. 27: 9, 10, came beyond a doubt from Zechariah; but they were quoted from memory, and are ascribed to Jeremiah. It is as improbable that Matthew, in order to show that Jesus was the Messiah, for which purpose proof of real validity was requisite, should have appealed to apocryphal writings, which might be objected to and could not confer on his attempt any convincing authority, as it is erroneous and contrary to all investigations concerning the canon to imagine that any part of the Old Testament has been lost since Matthew's time.

The passage is found in Zechariah, and in the same words; the arrangement only is different, as would be very natural in a quotation from memory. Zech. 11: 13, 14. *הִנֵּנִי מְבַאֵשׁ הַקֶּרָמִּים, καὶ ἔλαβον τὰ τριάντα ἀργύρια*—here we have, in the first place, the same clause and the same sum expressed. So too as to the words *τὴν τιμὴν τοῦ τιμιμημένου, ὃν ἐτιμήσαντο*, *הַתִּימָנִי מִכֶּרְתִּי מִכֶּרְתִּי אֶשֶׁר הִנֵּקְרָר אֶשֶׁר*; for the word *הַתִּימָנִי* is substituted *ἀπὸ τῶν νόων Ἰσραὴλ*, because *יִשְׂרָאֵל בֵּין* (for which he read *בֵּין*) occurs afterwards. Even the potter is mentioned in the Hebrew: *καὶ ἔδωκαν εἰς τὸν ἀγρόν τοῦ κεραμέως, הַיִּשְׂרָאֵלִי אֶרֶר אֶל-הַיּוֹצֵר אֶרֶר*. In common usage *יוֹצֵר* is a potter, the literal Aquila having translated it *πλάστης*. Lastly, the field too is mentioned; for *אֶרֶר* has this signification in Ezra and in Chaldaizing Hebrew. We have, therefore, all the prominent ideas of the passage and even the particular clauses and general language, as exhibited in Mat-

<sup>1</sup> A celebrated scholar thus speaks respecting this passage in the Evangelist: "If he translated from the Hebrew himself, he carefully selected *ἀσθενείας* and *νόσους* for *חֲלִי* and *מְבַאֵשׁ*, in order to adapt the passage perfectly to Christ's cures. And this very use of these words makes it probable that Matthew here made his own translation from the Hebrew." Eichhorn, in the Allg. Biblioth. der bibl. Litteratur. II. Band. 6tes Stück. p. 973.

thew. The form of the Greek, which is entirely suited to the purpose of the Evangelist, can hardly be attributed, as any intelligent person will admit, to any one but himself.

This peculiar proceeding in regard to passages of the Old Testament evinces rather the spirit of an author working according to his own ideas and bending every thing to a determinate plan, than a translator, of whom it could hardly be expected that he should enter into the views of the writer and act in conformity with them in such a manner as the author himself could not have done without great care.

Familiar as the author of the Greek text was with the Hebrew Old Testament, there are cases which plainly show that he had not any Hebrew original before him. The citation of Isaiah 29: 13, in Matth. 15: 9, is such a case. The Seventy have, indeed, given the general idea, but have by no means reached an exact expression of the original. There is nothing at all in the Hebrew corresponding to the word *ματην*; it would appear that the LXX read *הַנֶּחֱסִי* for *וְהַנֶּחֱסִי*; and there is no word for *διδάσκοντες* in Isaiah. The words *וְיִרְאֶתֶם אֹתִי* have been translated by *σέβονται με*, as if *וְיִרְאֶתֶם* was read; *מִלְמַדֵּה* is treated as a noun in the plural number, as if it were *מִלְמַדוֹת*, *διδασκαλῖαι*. This version, however, is not on these accounts the less literally quoted. It does not appear as if the author of the Greek was a translator who had the Hebrew text before him, and expressed it as well as he could, but as if he moulded it himself according to his own fancy and judgment.

We will now leave our Evangelist for a moment, but only with a view to prepare for further investigations respecting him.

### § 13.

#### MARK.

John Mark, whom the ancients represent as a disciple and fellow-traveller of Paul, was born, it would seem, at Jerusalem. At least his mother resided there, and believers assembled together in her house. (Acts 12: 12.) It was thither that Peter first went, when the angel delivered him from prison, expecting to be gladly received. He was not mistaken; he was received with all the marks of great joy.

John Mark, and the Mark mentioned with so endearing an appellation by Peter (1 Pet. 5: 13), can hardly be distinguished from one another because the name John is added to the former and not to the latter.<sup>1</sup> It ought not to have escaped the learned men, who on this account make these two different persons, that the surname was the common and distinctive appellation, and that John, *ὁ ἐπικληθεὶς Μάρκος* (Acts 12: 25,) and *Λεββαῖος ὁ ἐπικληθεὶς Θαδδαῖος, Ἰωσὴς ὁ ἐπικαλούμενος Βαρνάβας, Ἰσοῦπον τὸν καὶ Καῖαφα ἐπικαλούμενον*, (*Jos. Ant. L. XVIII. c. 2. n. 2.*) were in common life called simply Mark, Thaddeus, Barnabas, Caiaphas.

<sup>1</sup> Grotius Præf. in Marc. Cave, Hist. Litt. vol. I.

The following series of incidents in the life of this John, whose surname was Mark, will make it still more clear that he and Mark were one and the same person.

When Paul and Barnabas were at Jerusalem, about the time of Peter's imprisonment, they took John Mark to accompany them to Antioch. When, afterwards, these two men were prompted by the Spirit to proclaim the doctrines of Jesus in other lands, they selected this John Mark as their assistant and companion. (Acts 12: 25. 13: 5.)

He went with them to Cyprus: but when they removed from Paphos to Perga in their onward progress, Mark forsook them and returned to Jerusalem. (Acts 13: 13.)

Paul and Barnabas sometime after returned to Antioch; but their active disposition did not suffer them to rest long. They determined again to visit their brethren, for the purpose of observing the success of their enterprise and their labors. (Acts 15: 37.) Barnabas desired to have Mark again as a companion; but Paul refused, alleging that he had forsaken them the first time, and had failed to persevere under difficulties. Barnabas would not yield, preferring rather to separate from his fellow laborer, and went again with Mark to Cyprus. Paul chose Silas.

From this time no John Mark is mentioned in the New Testament; we find only Mark. (Coloss. 4: 10. 2 Tim. 4: 11. Philem. 24.) From the first passage, however, it is clear that this Mark is the same John Mark whom Paul and Barnabas associated with themselves at first, and on account of whom they separated. We here learn that he was related to Barnabas, ἀνεψιὸς τοῦ Βαρνάβα, and now perceive why Barnabas and Paul took him with them from Jerusalem, and why Barnabas was so attached to this Mark that he separated from Paul on his account, severed the ties of ancient friendship, and abandoned their common object, that he might have the youth by his side, and lastly, why he went with him a second time to Cyprus. Barnabas was a Cyprian by birth (Acts 4: 36); and Mark his kinsman, here met with many who were his relations by the side of Barnabas.

Paul was again reconciled to him, and, in his first imprisonment had him in his company at Rome. When subsequently he was sent back by Paul on business into Asia, he visited his old instructor, Peter, with whom, as is clear from the first Epistle of this Apostle (5: 13,) he connected himself, and whose amanuensis he seems to have been in the composition of the Epistle.

#### § 14.

As Mark, who left Jerusalem in company with Paul, must have been still a youth, when Peter was imprisoned by Agrippa, and as nothing occurs anywhere in regard to him which shows him to have been an eye-witness of facts and events concerning Jesus, it is proper to inquire as to the source of his accounts and the credentials of his historical authority. Whence then did Mark get his information as to what he narrates?

When we consider that there was an assembly of believers in his mother's house, and that Peter went thither first after his liberation, that



the latter honors him above all the believing Jews with the tender appellation *Μάρκος, ὁ υἱός μου*, (1 Pet. 5: 13,) we cannot doubt that he bestowed upon him his paternal care, a great part of which, with an Apostle, must have consisted of instruction. We must, therefore, refer his knowledge of the doctrines of Jesus, as well as his narrative in a great measure, to Peter. We might hence, moreover, consider it probable, though not absolutely demonstrated, that besides general information, he had the advantage of particular assistance and more minute instruction from the Apostle in prosecuting his work.

But history furnishes us positive assurance of this. The first witness to be sure, is Papias, whose testimony would be of little value, were it not supported by a specification of his authority. On this occasion, however, he appeals expressly to his voucher, John, an Ephesian Presbyter, who was probably contemporary with the fact which he asserts, or at all events with John the Evangelist, and from his circumstances and the time when he lived possessed some certain information respecting the documents of Christianity. According to his account, *οὗτος ὁ πρεσβύτερος λέγει*, Mark was not an immediate disciple of our Lord, but was intimately connected with Peter, and was his constant companion, carefully noted down all the narratives given by him in public assemblies, and formed them into a historical book. (Eusebius at the end of the III<sup>d</sup> book of his *H. E.*)

Clement of Alexandria says something similar, and corroborates it by the authority of the most ancient fathers, *ἀπὸ τῶν ἀνέκαθεν πρεσβυτέρων*, who are totally different persons from the preceding, judging from the tenor of the testimony. For it comprises, likewise, the assertion that the Gospels containing the genealogies appeared first; a declaration which Eusebius neither found anywhere in the works of Papias, nor specifies as one of his opinions or assertions, and the contrary of which is stated by Irenæus, who venerated Papias. He says now (*Euseb. H. E. L. VI. c. 14*) that Mark, who was for a long time in Peter's company, noted down his discourses, wrote them out, and thus composed his Gospel. What he subjoins, too, is peculiar to him, viz. that Mark composed it at the instance of believers, and put it into their hands, with no opposition and with no express approbation on the part of the Apostle.

Tertullian, in his fourth book against Marcion,<sup>1</sup> says it was asserted concerning Mark's Gospel, that it properly belonged to Peter, and Mark was only his interpreter. This we are told, too, by Origen.<sup>2</sup>

This is likewise the real signification of the passage in Justin's Dialogue with Trypho, in which he quotes the words of Mark concerning the sons of Zebedee, who were called sons of thunder, with the declaration that it was *ἐν τοῖς ἀπομνημονεύμασιν αὐτοῦ*, where *αὐτοῦ* refers to Peter.<sup>3</sup> Christ and Peter are mentioned just before, and *αὐτοῦ* cannot

<sup>1</sup> L. IV. c. 5. "Licet et Marci quod edidit, Petri affirmetur, cujus interpres Marcus."

<sup>2</sup> Euseb. H. E. L. VI. c. 25.

<sup>3</sup> Καὶ τὸ εἰπεῖν μετονομακέναι αὐτὸν Πέτρον ἓνα τῶν ἀποστόλων, καὶ γεγράφθαι ἐν τοῖς ἀπομνημονεύμασιν αὐτοῦ γεγενημένον, καὶ τοῦτο μετὰ τοῦ καὶ ἄλλους δύο ἀδελφούς υἱοὺς Ζεβεδαίου ὄντας μετονομακέναι ὀνόματι τοῦ Βοανεργῆς, ὅ ἐστιν υἱὸς βροντῆς, σημαντικὸν ἦν τοῦ αὐτὸν ἐκείνον εἶναι. Ed. Rob. Steph. p. 105. c. 106.



refer to both. Justin, however, invariably terms the Gospels ἀπομνημονεύματα τῶν ἀποστόλων, and never ἀπομνημονεύματα Χριστοῦ. Thus, in Justin's usual mode of speaking, the Gospel of Mark is ascribed to the Apostle under the denomination ἀπομνημονεύματα αὐτοῦ (Πέτρου.)

### § 15.

The Gospel written by Mark was, as we have already mentioned (§ 2,) intended for readers but slightly acquainted with Palestine and with Jewish manners and customs, whence the author was induced to render intelligible to his intended readers, by means of explanatory additions, much which was familiar to the most humble native of Palestine. But this circumstance designates those for whom this Gospel was intended only in a very general way. The remark he makes in Chap. 12. v. 42, is a little more definitive as to the circle of readers for whom he wrote.

He speaks of the λεπτόν, a coin common in Judea, and finds it necessary to inform his readers of its exact value. His procedure in this case is worthy of notice. He does not reckon like Josephus, who in such cases computed the amount in Attic money, stating the value of the shekel in drachms; but, to make himself intelligible to those whom he had in view, he subjoins the value of the λεπτόν in Roman money, and thus shows that he had his eye upon men who were better acquainted with the Roman currency than any other.

Contrary to the general custom of the biblical writers, he makes use of the Roman term *centurio* (ὁ κεντυρίων, 15: 39,) for a commander of sixty or a hundred soldiers. Josephus calls him ἐκατόνταρχος, as do likewise the other books of the New Testament; an evidence that this expression was in accordance with the usage of Palestine. It was, besides, the most intelligible word among the Greeks, it being a pure Greek term. This deviation from the Jewish and Greek usage can have been made only with reference to readers who were familiar with the Latin technical term, but not with the Greek.

History points us to Rome itself. Those ancient teachers, οἱ ἀνέκαθεν προσβύτεροι, extolled by Clement, relate in the passage above mentioned, that Mark combined Peter's discourses in a written narrative at Rome, and published it there at the request of the Christians.<sup>1</sup>

The time too, when according to historical evidence Mark published his Gospel, leads us to the conclusion that it must have been composed in the city which was then the capital of the world, and at all events, forbids us to fix upon any other place but this as the place of its completion and publication.

<sup>1</sup> This is corroborated, likewise, by other writers. Epiphanius. Hæres. LI. Ἀκόλουθος γενόμενος ὁ Μάρκος τῷ ἁγίῳ Πέτρῳ ἐν Ῥώμῃ, ἐπιτρέπεται τὸ εὐαγγέλιον ἐκθέσθαι, λ. Hieronym. in Catal. v. Marcus.—"Marcus discipulus et interpres Petri, juxta quod Petrum referentem audierat, rogatus Romæ a fratribus breve scripsit evangelium, etc."

## § 16.

It is true that the period at which Mark appeared as a historian is not stated alike by all the ancients: this want of unanimity, however, only renders the inquiry more tedious, but does not make the answer to our inquiry less certain. A story gained currency that Simon Magus tried the fortune of his magic arts even in Rome, and obtained divine honors. Justin Martyr was the original author of this story, and thought he found traces of the fact in the well-known inscription SEMONI DEO SANCO, the composition of which, either from its further contents, or from oral accounts, he assigns to the days of the Emperor Claudius.<sup>1</sup> The hasty inference of this father, who was not very well acquainted with the Roman language or the Italian mythology, became the basis of a still more extended tale. Peter had once in another place humbled the Magian; this fact was now united with Justin's story, and thus originated a complete narrative, the personages of which were Peter and Simon Magus, and the scene of which was laid at Rome. Chronology, which was called upon to find a place in the series of real events for this pretended occurrence, fixed it in the reign of Claudius, in accordance with the period assigned by Justin to the composition of the inscription. The inference was, that Peter must have been in Rome at this time, and as the circumstances appeared more suitable to the supposition than those of his last residence, in which he met his death, Mark must have composed his Gospel at this time.<sup>2</sup>

False as is the date assigned, yet these accounts, which connect fact with fiction concerning Mark's Gospel, agree in representing Rome as the place in which it was written.

Irenæus has given us another chronological statement, which, as far as respects Matthew, agrees perfectly with what we have inferred from the contents of the book (§ 5,) and is therefore fully confirmed by this means. This witness, whose veracity has never been impeached, informs us as follows respecting Mark's Gospel: "Matthew published his work when Peter and Paul were preaching at Rome, and founding a church there. After their *departure*, however, Mark, the disciple and interpreter of Peter, gave us in a composition of his own the accounts of Peter."<sup>3</sup> The words *μετὰ τοῦτων ἐξοδοῖ* admit a double signification: *after their death* Mark published his book, or *after their departure from Rome*. Grabe gives them the latter sense; Valois and others make them refer to their death.

The interpretation of Valois is the correct one. For Peter himself used this expression in speaking of his death, calling it his *ἐξοδος* (2 Peter 1: 14, 15,) Irenæus, it would seem, here had reference to this expression, applying to the event the peculiar word used by the Apostle.

<sup>1</sup> Justin's Larger Apology, c. 25. p. 144. Ed. Rob. Steph.

<sup>2</sup> Euseb. Chron. ad A. III. Claud.

<sup>3</sup> Ὁ μὲν δὲ Ματθαῖος ἐν τοῖς Ἑβραίοις τῇ ἰδίᾳ διαλέκτῳ αὐτῶν καὶ γραφὴν ἐξήνεγκε τοῦ εὐαγγελίου, τοῦ Πέτρου καὶ τοῦ Παύλου ἐν Ῥώμῃ εὐαγγελιζομένων, καὶ ἀπεμνημόνευον τὴν ἐκκλησίαν. Μετὰ δὲ τὴν τοῦτων ἐξοδόν, Μάρκος ὁ μαθητὴς καὶ ἐρμηνευτὴς Πέτρου καὶ αὐτὸς τὰ ὑπὸ Πέτρον χρησαμένα ἐγγράφως ἡμῖν παραδίδωκε. L. III. Adv. Hær. C. I. Euseb. H. E. L. V. c. 8.

The words are: After the *Reading of the Acts* Agrippa, Peter and Paul, who had preached in Rome. Now even if he like the latter writers supposed that Peter was here in Rome, but under Claudius and afterwards in the latter part of Nero's reign, yet the circumstances that he has connected Peter and Paul with each other, and their preaching and conversion, show clearly that he had in his mind the early days of the Apostles when they were in Rome together.

## § 17.

### MATTHEW AND MARK.

*Further investigations concerning their historical sources.*

Matthew and Mark relate almost all the same events throughout their histories, while on the contrary, the other Evangelists differ very much from one another as well as from Matthew and Mark in their relations of facts. It is therefore a reasonable inquiry: Whence arises the harmony between Matthew and Mark? How happens it that they have related exactly the same facts from the great multitude before them? Were we considering ordinary writers, who had such an extensive field of history before them, we should be easily led by such an appearance of agreement that one had the other before him while composing. But it is evident to all, they agreed in their mode of representing historical facts and in the course which they gave them, made use of the same number of sentences and clauses in carrying on a discourse, the same phraseology, the same order and position of the words, even to the adverbs and conjunctions, so frequently the case with our authors, that would be positive proof that they did not write independently of each other, but either the latter followed and made use of the earliest, or both drew liberally from a third common document.

Considering our Evangelists only as writers whose order and authority are not to be called in question, our aim will be determined by critical investigation, not only as to what respecting them *Tradition* had us but their similarity to some men greater than can easily be found between yet different writers, as the following examples will show.

As the first question is whether these books have any common value, we naturally cannot see their dependence on each other, which can only be proved when the point is decided. They agree, however, in the style of the sacred books was not imitated but changed in the sacred writers themselves, so that probably they sought profit of the analogy and gave necessity of the source whence from their style and genius.

## I.

## Matth. XV. 32 seq.

Προσκαλεσάμενος τοὺς μαθητὰς  
αὐτοῦ, εἶπεν αὐτοῖς·  
Σπλαγχνίζομαι ἐπὶ τὸν ὄχλον,  
ὅτι ἤδη ἡμέρας τρεῖς,  
προσμένονσίν μοι,  
καὶ οὐκ ἔχουσι τί φάγωσι.

Καὶ ἐκέλευσε τοῖς ὄχλοις  
ἀναπεσεῖν ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν·  
καὶ λαβὼν τοὺς ἐπὶ τὰ ἄρτους,  
. . . . . εὐχαριστήσας  
ἔκλασε, καὶ ἔδωκε  
τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ·  
οἱ δὲ μαθηταὶ  
τῷ ὄχλῳ.

Καὶ ἔφαγον πάντες, καὶ ἐχορτάσθησαν,  
καὶ ἦσαν τὸ περισσεύον  
τῶν κλασμάτων,  
ἐπὶ τὰ σπυρίδας.

## Mark VIII. 1 seq.

Προσκαλεσάμενος τοὺς μαθητὰς  
αὐτοῦ, λέγει αὐτοῖς·  
Σπλαγχνίζομαι ἐπὶ τὸν ὄχλον,  
ὅτι ἤδη ἡμέρας τρεῖς,  
προσμένονσίν μοι,  
καὶ οὐκ ἔχουσι τί φάγωσι.

Καὶ παρήγγειλε τῷ ὄχλῳ  
ἀναπεσεῖν ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς·  
καὶ λαβὼν τοὺς ἐπὶ τὰ ἄρτους,  
εὐχαριστήσας  
ἔκλασε, καὶ ἐδίδου  
τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ,  
ἵνα παραθῶσι· καὶ παρέθηκεν  
τῷ ὄχλῳ . . . . .

Ἐφαγον δὲ, καὶ ἐχορτάσθησαν  
καὶ ἦσαν περισσεύματα  
κλασμάτων,  
ἐπὶ τὰ σπυρίδας.

## II.

## Matth. XIII. 4 seq.

Καὶ ἐν τῷ σπείρειν αὐτὸν,  
ἃ μὲν ἔπεσε παρὰ τὴν ὁδὸν·  
καὶ ἦλθε τὰ πετεινὰ,  
καὶ κατέφαγεν αὐτά.

Ἄλλα δὲ ἔπεσεν ἐπὶ  
τὰ πετρῶδη,  
ὅπου οὐκ εἶχε γῆν πολλήν·  
καὶ εὐθέως ἐξανέτειλε,  
διὰ τὸ μὴ ἔχειν βάθος γῆς·  
ἡλίου δὲ ἀνατείλαντος,  
ἐκαυματίσθη·  
καὶ διὰ τὸ μὴ ἔχειν ῥίζαν,  
ἐξηράνθη.

Ἄλλα δὲ ἔπεσεν ἐπὶ τὰς  
ἀκάνθας·  
καὶ ἀνέβησαν αἱ ἄκανθαι,  
καὶ ἀπέπνιξαν αὐτά.

Ἄλλα δὲ ἔπεσεν ἐπὶ  
τὴν γῆν τὴν καλήν·  
καὶ ἐδίδου καρπὸν.

## Mark IV. 4 seq.

Καὶ ἐγένετο ἐν τῷ σπείρειν,  
ὃ μὲν ἔπεσε παρὰ τὴν ὁδὸν·  
καὶ ἦλθε τὰ πετεινὰ  
καὶ κατέφαγεν αὐτό.

Ἄλλο δὲ ἔπεσεν ἐπὶ  
τὸ πετρῶδες,  
ὅπου οὐκ εἶχε γῆν πολλήν·  
καὶ εὐθέως ἐξανέτειλε,  
διὰ τὸ μὴ ἔχειν βάθος γῆς·  
ἡλίου δὲ ἀνατείλαντος  
ἐκαυματίσθη·  
καὶ διὰ τὸ μὴ ἔχειν ῥίζαν  
ἐξηράνθη.

Ἄλλο δὲ ἔπεσεν ἐπὶ τὰς  
ἀκάνθας·  
καὶ ἀνέβησαν αἱ ἄκανθαι,  
καὶ συνέπνιξαν αὐτό,  
καὶ καρπὸν οὐκ ἔδωκε.  
Καὶ ἄλλο ἔπεσεν εἰς  
τὴν γῆν τὴν καλήν·  
καὶ ἐδίδου καρπὸν.



v. 20.

Ὁ δὲ ἐπὶ τὰ πετρώδη  
 σπαρεῖς,  
 οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ τὸν λόγον ἀκούων  
 καὶ εὐθὺς μετὰ χαρᾶς  
 λαμβάνων αὐτόν,  
 οὐκ ἔχει δὲ ῥίζαν ἐν ἑαυτῷ,  
 ἀλλὰ πρόσκαιρός ἐστι·  
 γενομένης δὲ θλίψεως  
 ἢ διωγμοῦ διὰ τὸν λόγον,  
 εὐθὺς σκανδαλίζεται.  
 Ὁ δὲ εἰς τὰς  
 ἀκάνθας σπαρεῖς,  
 οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ τὸν λόγον ἀκούων,  
 καὶ ἡ μέριμνα τοῦ αἰῶνος  
 καὶ ἡ ἀπάτη τοῦ πλούτου

συμπνίγει τὸν λόγον,  
 καὶ ἄκαρπος γίνεται.

v. 16.

Καὶ οὗτοί . . . ἐπὶ τὰ πετρώδη  
 σπειρόμενοι,  
 οἱ, ὅταν ἀκούσωσι τὸν λόγον,  
 εὐθέως μετὰ χαρᾶς  
 λαμβάνουσιν αὐτόν·  
 καὶ οὐκ ἔχουσιν ῥίζαν ἐν ἑαυτοῖς,  
 ἀλλὰ πρόσκαιροί εἰσιν·  
 εἴτα γενομένης θλίψεως  
 ἢ διωγμοῦ διὰ τὸν λόγον,  
 εὐθέως σκανδαλίζονται.  
 Καὶ οὗτοί εἰσιν οἱ εἰς τὰς  
 ἀκάνθας σπειρόμενοι,  
 οἱ τὸν λόγον ἀκούοντες,  
 καὶ αἱ μέριμναι τοῦ αἰῶνος,  
 καὶ ἡ ἀπάτη τοῦ πλούτου,  
 καὶ αἱ περὶ τὰ λοιπὰ ἐπιθυμίαι  
 εἰσπορευόμεναι,  
 συμπνίγουσι τὸν λόγον  
 καὶ ἄκαρπος γίνεται.

## III.

Matth. XXVI. 47 seq.

Καὶ ἔτι αὐτοῦ λαλοῦντος,  
 ἰδοὺ Ἰούδας, εἷς τῶν δώδεκα,  
 ἦλθε,  
 καὶ μετ' αὐτοῦ ὄχλος πολὺς  
 μετὰ μαχαιρῶν  
 καὶ ξύλων,  
 ἀπὸ τῶν ἀρχιερέων  
 καὶ πρεσβυτέρων τοῦ λαοῦ.

Ὁ δὲ παραδιδούς αὐτόν, ἔδωκεν  
 αὐτοῖς σημεῖον, λέγων·  
 Ὃν ἂν φιλήσω, αὐτός ἐστι  
 κρατήσατε αὐτόν.

Καὶ εὐθέως προσελθὼν  
 τῷ Ἰησοῦ, εἶπε· Χαῖρε, ῥαββί.  
 Καὶ κατεφίλησεν αὐτόν.

Mark XIV. 43 seq.

Καὶ εὐθέως, ἔτι αὐτοῦ λαλοῦντος,  
 παραγίνεται  
 Ἰούδας, εἷς ὢν τῶν δώδεκα,  
 καὶ μετ' αὐτοῦ ὄχλος πολὺς  
 μετὰ μαχαιρῶν  
 καὶ ξύλων,  
 παρὰ τῶν ἀρχιερέων  
 καὶ τῶν γραμματέων καὶ τῶν  
 πρεσβυτέρων.

Δεδώκει δὲ ὁ παραδιδούς αὐτόν  
 σύσσημον αὐτοῖς, λέγων·  
 Ὃν ἂν φιλήσω, αὐτός ἐστιν·  
 κρατήσατε αὐτόν  
 καὶ ἀπαγάγετε ἀσφαλῶς.  
 Καὶ ἐλθὼν, εὐθέως προσελθὼν  
 αὐτῷ, λέγει· Ῥαββί, ῥαββί·  
 καὶ κατεφίλησεν αὐτόν.

## IV.

Matth. XXIV. 32 seq.

Ἀπὸ δὲ τῆς συκῆς  
μάθετε τὴν παραβολήν·  
ὅταν ἦδη ὁ κλάδος αὐτῆς  
γένηται ἀπαλός,  
καὶ τὰ φύλλα ἐκφύη,  
γινώσκετε, ὅτι ἐγγύς τὸ θέρος.

Οὕτω καὶ ὑμεῖς,  
ὅταν ἴδῃτε πάντα ταῦτα,  
γινώσκετε, ὅτι ἐγγύς ἐστιν  
ἐπὶ θύραις.

Ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν,  
οὐ μὴ παρέλθῃ ἡ γενεὰ αὕτη,  
ἕως ἂν πάντα ταῦτα  
γένηται.

Ὁ οὐρανὸς καὶ ἡ γῆ παρελεύσονται·  
οἱ δὲ λόγοι μου  
οὐ μὴ παρέλθωσι.

Mark XIII. 28 seq.

Ἀπὸ δὲ τῆς συκῆς  
μάθετε τὴν παραβολήν·  
ὅταν αὐτῆς ἦδη ὁ κλάδος  
ἀπαλὸς γένηται,  
καὶ ἐκφύῃ τὰ φύλλα,  
γινώσκετε, ὅτι ἐγγύς τὸ θέρος ἐστίν.

Οὕτω καὶ ὑμεῖς,  
ὅταν ταῦτα ἴδῃτε γινόμενα,  
γινώσκετε ὅτι ἐγγύς ἐστιν  
ἐπὶ θύραις.

Ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν,  
οὐ οὐ μὴ παρέλθῃ ἡ γενεὰ αὕτη,  
μέχρις οὐ πάντα ταῦτα  
γένηται.

Ὁ οὐρανὸς καὶ ἡ γῆ παρελεύσονται·  
οἱ δὲ λόγοι μου  
οὐ μὴ παρέλθωσι.

Can a similarity like this, which, though it do not exist throughout, might be exhibited in many other passages, be attributed to mere accident? Or how could any man with extracts like these from profane writers lying before him, doubt that one had borrowed from the other, that the later writer was dependent on his predecessor?

## § 18.

But may not both have drawn from the same common sources, and this be the cause of their agreement? When such appearances are presented, this is certainly a second supposable case. Both might have had, perhaps, some Hebrew history of Jesus before them, as their guide in composing. From the fact that in ancient times there was a report current in regard to such a Hebrew original; that our books appear as if they were translations from such a document, that their similarity, and at the same time the difference in phraseology frequently apparent, as well as their other mutual discrepancies, may be thus explained and reconciled, and many passages elucidated; we are tempted to regard this hypothesis as something more than an hypothesis.

Indeed, some recent essays on the Gospels<sup>1</sup> have so perfected and set off this theory, that one could not but be extremely prepossessed in its favor, were there not certain difficulties remaining, which from their apparently trivial character were not taken into account, but are in reality decisive against it.

If Matthew and Mark had translated from a common Hebrew original, their works would not have coincided so exactly as they do in many places even as to the minutest points in phraseology.

1. The copiousness of the Greek language furnished more than one

<sup>1</sup> Eichhorn, Allgem. Biblioth. der bibl. Litt. V. Band, 5th and 6th Stück.

expression corresponding to most Hebrew words; so that in the case supposed they might have differed much more widely from each other than they have. By examining the second passage cited in proof of their similarity (Matt. 13: 4 and Mark 4: 4 seq.,) and referring to Luke, who is said to have likewise followed this common original, it will be perceived in how many ways they might have deviated from each other even in the most simple expressions: *καὶ ἀνέβησαν αἱ ἄκανθαι καὶ ἀπέπνιξαν αὐτό* is given thus by Luke (8: 7,) *καὶ συμφυεῖσθαι αἱ ἄκανθαι ἀπέπνιξαν αὐτό*—Matth. Mark: *ἀλλὰ δὲ ἔπεσεν ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν τὴν καλήν.* Luke: *καὶ ἕτερον ἔπεσε εἰς τὴν γῆν τὴν ἀγαθὴν.*—M. M: *διὰ τὸ μὴ ἔχειν βάθος γῆς.* Luke: *διὰ τὸ μὴ ἔχειν ἱκμάδα.*—M. M: *ἀλλὰ δὲ ἔπεσεν ἐπὶ τὰ πετρῶδη.* Luke: *καὶ ἕτερον ἔπεσε ἐπὶ τὴν πέτραν.*

2. Now when we compare the structure of the Hebrew, Chaldee, or Syriac Language with that of the Greek, such an agreement is totally inexplicable. The former have only two tenses, a past and future (and two of them, in some cases, a sign for the pluperfect); while on the other hand the Greek has two future tenses of common occurrence in the New Testament, and the following past tenses, viz. an imperfect, a perfect, a first and second aorist, in the active voice, and as many tenses for the same use in the middle voice. Hence to express a past tense of the Hebrew or Syriac language, the Greek often had about eight tenses at command; and in very many cases four might be used to express the future. How then did it happen, that where they agree in expression, they generally coincide in using the same tense in Greek? The original could not have led to this. Let us examine the first of the passages adduced; instead of *προσκαλεσάμενος τοὺς μαθητὰς αὐτοῦ*, or *ܡܬܝܬܝܠܡܝܬܝܗܘܢ*, might have stood likewise *προσκαλέσας, προσκαλῶν*; instead of *ἀναπεσεῖν ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς*, *ܓܪܕܝܬ ܥܠ ܒܝܬ ܕܗܝܬ*, *ἀναπέσαι, ἀναπεσέσθαι, ἀναπέσασθαι, ἀναπίπτειν, or ἀναπίπτεισθαι*; for *λαβών*, the word *εἰληφώς, λαβόμενος, or λαμβάνων*, might just as well have been used; for *εὐχαριστήσας*—*εὐχαριστῶν, εὐχαριστησάμενος, &c.* In the third example, too, for *λαλοῦντος* might have been used *λαλοῦμένου, λαλήσαντος, λαλησαμένου*; for *κρατήσαι*—*κρατεῖτε, κρατήσασθε*. Notwithstanding the numerous future tenses of the Greek, the New Testament, by an extraordinary idiom, sometimes employs a peculiar one, formed in the subjunctive mode. (*Glassius Philol. Sac. P. I. Ed. Dathii*, p. 313.) Now, whenever Matthew allows himself to make use of this grammatical anomaly, it appears in the same place in Mark, as, for instance, is to be seen in example No. IV, where, instead of *οὐ μὴ παρελεύσεται*, we find *οὐ μὴ παρέλθῃ ἡ γενεά*, and instead of *οἱ λόγοι μου οὐ μὴ παρέλθουσιν* or *παρελεύσονται*—*οὐ μὴ παρέλθωσι*.

2. It is well known that the Syriac, Hebrew, &c. has no verbs compounded with adverbs; while the Greek, by means of composition with *σύν, μετά, ἐπί, παρά, κατὰ, εἰς, πρὸς*, and the like, possesses an abundant store of expression. The Grecian is not always under any necessity of using these, but avails himself of them to give greater precision to his language, for which purpose he has a large number ready for his choice; and often uses them only for the sake of variety. The Jew and Syrian have, generally speaking, no expedient of this kind at command; and it is but seldom that such a signification is contained in the

root, though sometimes it is, as in  $\text{סָרַח}$  *he went out*,  $\text{סָרַח}$  *he went up*. But as this is not very often the case, there is always, even when there appears a reason from the connexion for the use of such a compound word, a freedom of choice from the copiousness of the Greek. For  $\text{ἡτοιμασάμενος τοὺς μαθητάς}$ —we might use *συγκαλεῖν*, *μετακαλεῖν*, *κατακαλεῖν*; for *προσμένουσι*—*περιμένουσι*, *παραμένουσι*, *συμμένουσι*, *καταμένουσι*. *Αἱ μέριμναι συμπνίγουσι τὸν λόγον* might be expressed also by *ἀποπνίγουσι*, *καταπνίγουσι*, *ἐμπνίγουσι*. Both Evangelists, moreover, frequently use compound words without any sort of necessity. For instance, in the 3d example cited, in *προσελθὼν . . . κατεφίλησεν αὐτόν* the compound word was so unnecessary that Luke contents himself with *τοῦ φιλεῖν αὐτόν*; for *εὐθέως ἐξάντειλε*, *διὰ τὸ μὴ ἔχειν βάθος*, in the 2d example, *ἀνέτειλε* was quite sufficient. Of the same character, likewise, is the following example :

## Matt. XX. 25.

Οἰδατε ὅτι οἱ ἄρχοντες  
τῶν ἐθνῶν  
κατακυριεύουσιν αὐτῶν  
καὶ οἱ μεγάλοι  
κατεξουσιάζουσιν αὐτῶν.

## Mark X. 42.

Οἰδατε ὅτι οἱ δοκοῦντες ἄρχειν  
τῶν ἐθνῶν  
κατακυριεύουσιν αὐτῶν  
καὶ οἱ μεγάλοι αὐτῶν  
κατεξουσιάζουσιν αὐτῶν.

Here the compound word *κατακυριεύουσιν* is unnecessary, and was not occasioned by the Hebrew : Luke has merely *κυριεύουσιν*. So too with *κατεξουσιάζουσιν*, which Luke expresses by *ἐξουσιάζοντες*. They might have used too, *ἐπικυριεύουσιν* and *ἀνακυριεύουσιν*, as well as *ἐπεξουσιάζουσι*, or the proper word *αὐτεξουσιάζουσι*.

4. The orientals have no adjectives derived from substantives.<sup>1</sup> Hence, when the Evangelists use them, they did not come from the Hebrew, but are instances of license on the part of the translator. And yet Matthew and Mark agree in the use of them. They tell us that the Baptist had a *ζώνην ΔΕΡΜΑΤΙΝΗΝ περὶ τὴν ὀσφύν αὐτοῦ*. This word cannot be translated into Syriac and Arabic, except by means of a noun, changing the expression to  $\text{ܕܡܬܥܠܐ ܕܕܥܡܐܢܐ}$ , *ζώνη δέρματος*. The word *ἄγναφος* could be rendered in these latter languages only by circumlocution, or by  $\text{ܕܡܬܥܠܐ ܕܕܥܡܐܢܐ}$ , *καίνος*. (Matt. 9: 16, Mark 2: 21.) *Ἄτιμος* in Matt. 13: 57 and Mark 6: 4, is expressed in Luke by *οὐ δεκτός* and in John 4: 44 by *τιμὴν οὐκ ἔχει*. If we examine the second passage cited above, we shall find several other instances: *ἐπὶ τὰ πετρώδη*; Luke uses *ἐπὶ τὴν πέτραν*, and so it must have been in the original, as the Syriac translator has  $\text{ܕܡܬܥܠܐ ܕܕܥܡܐܢܐ}$ . *Ἀλλὰ πρός-καιροί εἰσι*; Luke has *πρὸς καιρόν*, and so likewise the oriental,

<sup>1</sup> This is subject to some limitation as respects the Arabian, who uses  $\text{الهوى}$  *انسانى*, etc.



אֲחַרְיוֹתָא. Ἀκαρπος γίνεται; for this the oriental has no corresponding adjective, and is obliged to write אֲחַרְיוֹתָא אֲחַרְיוֹתָא, فلا ثمر فيه.

We even find them in one passage very unexpectedly agreeing in the use of the same dialect, the Æolic; Matt. 26: 69, Mark 16: 68, καὶ οὐ ᾔσθα μετὰ Ἰησοῦ κ. τ. λ.

So frequent agreement between two writers, in cases in which the character of the language into which they translated afforded numerous possibilities of a different choice of phraseology, and the language from which they translated could not lead them to any agreement, are not to be accounted for on the supposition of a common original text.

5. The citations from the Old Testament, as has been shown before, (§ 12) are managed with great and characteristic freedom and dexterity by Matthew. Nor does Mark desert his predecessor in this point. Matthew (11: 10) deviated from the LXX, in the citation of Malachi 3: 1—ἰδοὺ ἐξαποστέλλω τὸν ἄγγελόν μου καὶ ἐπιβλέψεται ὁδὸν πρὸ προσώπου μου, and translated it with more pointed application to the Baptist's office and mission: ἰδοὺ ἀποστέλλω τὸν ἄγγελόν μου πρὸ προσώπου σου, ὅς κατασκευάσει τὴν ὁδὸν σου ἔμπροσθέν σου. Mark cites the words precisely in the same way (1: 2,) and ascribes them to Isaiah, which shows that he did not take them from the prophet himself.

The words of Isaiah 29: 13, in Matth. 15: 8, 9, of which something was said in § 12, were taken from the LXX indeed, but quoted from memory, on which account they present a peculiar appearance as to their order and grammatical forms. The Apostle says: ὁ λαὸς οὗτος τοῖς χειλέσιν με τιμᾷ, ἡ δὲ καρδία αὐτῶν πόρρω ἀπέχει ἀπ' ἐμοῦ. Μάτην σέβονται με, διδάσκοντες διδασκαλίας, ἐντάλματα ἀνθρώπων; the LXX. have τιμῶσιν με instead of μέ τιμᾷ and give the last words thus: μάτην δὲ σέβονται με, διδάσκοντες ἐντάλματα ἀνθρώπων καὶ διδασκαλίας. Mark (7: 6, 7,) has likewise cited these words with the same variations and the same freedom.

The words of Zech. 13: 7 were translated by Matthew himself, or else his memory did not faithfully recall the translation of the LXX.; yet Mark agrees with him (14: 27.) It cannot be an accidental circumstance that he deserted the Septuagint whenever Matthew did, that he translated precisely as he did, and exhibits the citations from the Old Testament with exactly the same variations as Matthew. The reason of this, however, is to be sought somewhere else than in the Hebrew Bible.

These facts do not permit any hesitation on our part absolutely to reject the notion of an original document as their common source, to which for the most part they literally adhered. One must have had the other before him, and in the Greek language too; the earlier must have drawn from the later, i. e., according to history, Mark must have made use of Matthew.

## § 19.

Since these investigations concerning the Gospels were first published the state of the question has been somewhat altered. The opinion is now generally abandoned, that the first three Gospels are mere translations from a Hebrew original, which in course of time received here and there various additions, whence it happened that the Evangelists varied in respect to the number of events related, their circumstances etc. according to the copies which they obtained. For, while their dissimilarity was accounted for in this way, the explanation was rebutted by their unaccountable coincidence in phraseology in many passages.

A learned Englishman, in particular, was brought to this conviction by a comparison of several English versions of the same text of the Gospels. The experiment showed him how little of such coincidence there is between several translators, even in respect to the most simple clauses.

He did not, however, on this account give up the idea of an original Hebrew copy; but sought to sustain it by a subsidiary hypothesis. The original Hebrew Gospel, he supposes, was soon after its publication, translated by some one into Greek. This version was before our Evangelists, in the passages in which they coincide literally with each other.

This learned man, however, perceived clearly that a Greek version merely was not sufficient to explain all the appearances presented; for sometimes all three agree literally and must have had before them a common version of these passages, and sometimes two only agree in phraseology to the exclusion of the third, and must have had a version of such passages with which the third was unacquainted and from the use of which he was debarred. This last case occurred in three different ways; viz. either Matthew and Mark thus agreed together, or Matthew and Luke, or Luke and Mark; in each of which cases it was necessary to suppose a peculiar version of the passage in question from which they borrowed their phraseology. To avoid all these difficulties he availed himself of an ingenious idea in respect to Matthew, which dispensed with these separate versions. Let us however hear his own concise exhibition of his theory.

“St. Matthew, St. Mark and St. Luke,” says he, “all three used copies of the common Hebrew document  $\alpha$ ; the materials of which St. Matthew, who wrote in Hebrew, retained in the language in which he found them, but St. Mark and St. Luke translated them into Greek. They had no knowledge of each other’s Gospels; but St. Mark and St. Luke, besides their copies of the Hebrew document  $\alpha$ , used a Greek translation of it, which had been made before any of the additions  $\beta$ ,  $\gamma$ , etc. had been inserted. Lastly, as the Gospels of St. Mark and St. Luke contain Greek translations of Hebrew materials, which were incorporated into St. Matthew’s Hebrew Gospel, the person who translated St. Matthew’s Hebrew Gospel into Greek, frequently derived assistance from the Gospel of St. Mark, where St. Mark had matter in common with Matthew; and in those places, but in those places only, where St.

Mark had no matter in common with St. Matthew, he had frequently recourse to St. Luke's Gospel."<sup>1</sup>

This theory, as thus presented, explains all appearances in regard to the literal agreement of the Evangelists, and hence has the recommendation of not being defective on this point. But it takes for granted as its fundamental position, something which it is impossible to prove, viz. that the Gospel of Matthew was written in Hebrew; and moreover presupposes an original Hebrew Gospel, and likewise that there existed a Greek translation of it, to say nothing of the Hebrew *Γνωμολογία* which it assumes.

A celebrated German scholar, perceiving how questionable was the first position in respect to Matthew, in order to avoid it, and still retain the main idea of an original Gospel, chose rather to adopt a very complex theory abounding in hypotheses, which is in substance comprehended under the following heads.

I. There was an original Hebrew Gospel in circulation before the composition of our three Gospels. This was early translated into Greek, and was the common source of our Evangelists in cases in which all the three coincide in phraseology.<sup>2</sup>

II. But where only Matthew and Mark agree literally, the basis of both was a copy of the original Gospel which had already been enriched with some additions. These additions likewise existed in a Greek form; and in this form they were made use of by both Evangelists for the sake of facilitating their task.<sup>3</sup>

III. Where the narrative of Matthew and Luke harmonises, and there is even a coincidence in phraseology, the ground work is other Hebrew additions which were appended to the original Gospels by some intelligent person, and of which likewise there was a Greek translation. This translation was used by other writers and fully explains their literal agreement.<sup>4</sup>

Consequently of these three Hebrew and three Greek documents, making six in all, our Evangelists formed three. Liberal as the German scholar has been in the creation of documents and sources, his theory is yet deficient as to the explanation of one fact; although it is the first requisite in regard to an hypothesis that it be sufficient to explain all the phenomena connected with it. He represents the case in which Luke and Mark, to the exclusion of Matthew, agree literally, (a case which sometimes presents itself, as is clear from the examples exhibited below § 37.) as not worthy of notice.<sup>5</sup> It is true that this case does not occur very often; but *how often* is of no consequence. Even were there only the last two clauses of the examples cited in the section referred to above, there would still be too great an agreement to be ascribed

<sup>1</sup> Herbert Marsh's Notes and additions to Michaelis' Introd. Translated from the English by E. F. K. Rosenmüller, Götting. 1803. II. Th. p. 284. [2d Eng. Ed. of the original, Vol. III. Part. II. p. 361.]

<sup>2</sup> J. Gottfr. Eichhorn, Einleit. in das N. T. I. Bd. Leips. 1804. § 45-55 and p. 182.

<sup>3</sup> Idem, Ibid. § 67. p. 319, 320.

<sup>4</sup> Idem, Ibid. § 77-83. p. 344-351.

<sup>5</sup> Idem, Ibid. § 37. p. 38, 40.

to chance, and we should thus be forced to assume a peculiar version of this phrase likewise, making the fourth in number, in order to explain the coincidence, or else admit that one of the two Evangelists had the other under his eye and transferred this passage from him. But this agreement is not observable in many passages of considerable length, but, generally speaking, only in single scattered sentences, of which it cannot be supposed that there was a peculiar Greek version. Thus these appearances would compel us at all events to recur to the supposition that the later of the two Evangelists saw the composition of the other.

Not long ago the following suppositions were devised by a learned man for the purpose of simplifying these theories.<sup>1</sup> I. There existed an original Hebrew or Syro-Chaldaic Gospel for the use of those who preached the Christian faith in Palestine, from which Matthew composed his in the same language. II. When the doctrines of Christianity began to be preached in other lands, this original Gospel was translated into Greek and enriched with several additions. III. From this latter book Mark and Luke composed their Gospels, whence arose an agreement between them in matter and phraseology, in such passages as they have in common. IV. Matthew, too, was translated into Greek, and the translator while employed in his work made use of Mark's Gospel, and thus occasioned the frequently striking similarity of expression. V. He sometimes even interpolated Matthew from Mark, and hence arose an agreement between them in respect to matter, in cases in which Luke differs from both. VI. Where, however, Matthew and Luke agree, to the exclusion of Mark, the coincidence was occasioned by subsequent interpolations, such passages, having been transferred into Luke from Matthew. VII. Where the translation of the original Gospel had nothing added to it subsequently, all three coincide in matter, and, on account of what is stated in Nos. II and IV, even in phraseology.

The peculiar characteristic of this theory, viz. the supposition of interpolations, enabled the author to diminish the number of documents, of which so many were necessary according to the theory of Eichhorn.

## § 20.

Besides the fact that each of these theories is not an individual hypothesis, but consists of many particular hypotheses united, and that the second of them does not even account for all appearances, and the third, as we shall show in the sequel, wants internal validity; there are general objections against them all, which have never been answered. The chief of these, arranged under five heads, respect the original Gospel. Our position is that such an one never existed.

1. Such a work for a long time could be of no use as a history, to inform the inhabitants of Palestine of what Jesus had done. It could not possibly tell them so much as they themselves had seen, and as a multitude of eyewitnesses knew and could relate for many years after.

---

<sup>1</sup> Gratz, *Neuer Versuch, die Entstehung der drey ersten Evangelien zu erklären*. Tübing. 1812.



2. What then could be the object of it? to meet what want was it composed? The reply is that a written document was necessary to guide the preachers of the Gospel, so that they might exactly concur with each other in their doctrinal positions and their discourses. Very well; but, for the same reason which rendered it useless to put in circulation among the people any historical book, the history was not even taught orally, so long as it was made known by the general voice of persons in Palestine who were contemporary with the events. The mode of teaching practised by the apostles, as we shall show when we come to explain Luke's introduction to his Gospel, was to assume the history of our Lord as something well known and admitted, and to connect inferences or doctrines with the accounts certified by common report; particularly, likewise, to cite in comparison passages of the Old Testament, in order to prove that what was said in the prophets respecting the Messiah had met with its fulfilment in Jesus.

Even in foreign lands, it was not possible for the apostles, unless they abode long in one place as Paul did at Corinth and Ephesus, to enter into a regular narrative of the fortunes and acts of Jesus.

3. Consequently, in a doctrinal discourse the principal aim must have been to make an application of prophetic passages; for which purpose it became necessary to keep note of the events to which such passages related.

But neither was there at first any written exhibition of these to serve as a guide, though one was composed in the sequel. Before there could have been any such written account, all Christians were in the habit of seeking for the events of Jesus' life in the prophecies, and of finding them there described.

Not long after our Lord's resurrection, Peter, on the day of Pentecost, took occasion from the charge of intoxication to direct his discourse by an ingenious transition to an explanation of the Messianic days, and then to Jesus the Messiah, whose death and resurrection he showed to have been predicted in the Old Testament (Acts 2: 14—42;) and this so as to convince three thousand persons. As yet there was not even any plan of operation, much less any books of instruction; nor did this first unpremeditated experiment on the part of Peter, much as it was recommended by its success, give rise to any expedient of this kind. His observation on what is said in Ps. 16: of the death and resurrection of the Messiah was not transferred into the original Gospel; for Matthew, who expressly undertook to exhibit such comparisons throughout his whole book, did not find it there, nor did any other of the Evangelists.

We forbear to comment on Peter's subsequent discourses; but we must say a few words of the discourse of Philip. He explained to the officer of Candace, without any premeditation, the words of Isaiah 43: 7 seq. as relating to Jesus the Messiah (Acts 8: 32—36.) Notwithstanding the significance with which this passage of the prophet represents the conduct of Jesus in his sufferings and death, it has not found its way into either of our books, which are said to have been derived from the original Gospel.

If ever such a book had been composed as a guide in reference to the application of prophetic passages, it would certainly have been founded on the earliest and most successful attempts at conversion made by the

leaders and chief speakers among the Christians. But this was not the case, as is shown by the examples we have cited. Generally, too, Mark has but few comparisons of prophecies in his book, and Luke still fewer; but such comparisons could not have escaped them if they drew their materials from an original Gospel of this kind.

4. Moreover, an original Gospel, archetype, prototype, or whatever the imagined book may be called, is contradicted by history. \* Those Cyprians and Cyrenians, whom flight from persecution led to Antioch, taught there and founded a church, and yet no idea was entertained of providing them with a written history (Acts 11: 21, 22.) If these persons could do this without such a manual, why not the eye-witnesses of the history and specially authorised teachers?

Paul had even already passed through the south of Asia Minor with Barnabas, without any written document of the kind. A long time after, when he had returned from his journey, he held conversation with the apostles at Jerusalem in regard to his doctrinal views, that he might not labor and strive in vain. (Galat. 2: 1, 2.) Thus too Barnabas, his assistant and fellow-traveller, knew nothing of any book of instruction, although he was deputed by the apostles with full authority as a teacher to regulate the affairs of the church at Antioch (Acts 11: 22 seq.) and had imparted instruction to the society for a whole year, with the assistance of Paul.<sup>1</sup> Now how can we suppose the existence of a manual to guide the Apostles in the duties of their office, while Paul and Barnabas knew nothing of it, when they preached to the church at Antioch, nor at a later period, more than twenty years after our Lord's death, after they had travelled over many countries of Asia Minor in the exercise of their ministerial vocation?

It is clear that Paul adhered to no such book; but had himself entered into investigations concerning our Lord's history, and was in possession of accounts which we seek in vain in the writings of others. Take for instance the beautiful saying of our Lord which he mentions in Acts 20: 35; the words of Christ at the last supper, (1 Cor. 11: 24—27,) in regard to which Paul is followed by Luke (22: 19, 20); and the particular information he gives us respecting the resurrection, (1 Cor. 15: 5—7.)<sup>2</sup>

5. As more than twenty years after Jesus' death no written plan of instruction was communicated to the persons sent forth as teachers, if there ever was such an one it must have been composed at a subsequent period. But then it certainly could not have been written in the Hebrew or Aramæan language, as is imagined. Of what use would have been a work of this kind in Hebrew, after Christianity had been preached every where in Palestine and its vicinity, and the Greeks were now becoming believers?

But on the other hand Hebrew phrases are pointed out to us, which, it is said, make it evident that our Evangelists translated from the He-

<sup>1</sup> As the deputies of the Apostles to Antioch had no document communicated to them, they had not any Greek translation of one for the use of the church at Antioch, as is alleged. Gratz, *Neuer Versuch*, &c. § 27. p. 108, 109.

<sup>2</sup> If the memoranda which Paul had concerning the life and doctrines of Jesus are to be termed his *Gospel*, so be it; but his collections and the so-called original Gospel, have no connexion with each other.

brew. There certainly are passages in which they differ from each other in a single word or clause, though otherwise harmonizing; one selecting this, and the other that, particular expression. And in such cases, as soon as we call to mind the corresponding Hebrew or Aramæan word, we see clearly the source of their difference in phraseology; as e. g. (to choose the simplest instance,) Matthew calls the servant of the centurion *παῖς*, and Luke *δοῦλος*, צַדִּיק in Hebrew signifying both.

But this might have happened without the intervention of any Hebrew book. These writers did what we are all obliged to do when we undertake to speak or write a living language which we have but imperfectly learned. Hebrews and Aramæans as they were, they thought in their mother-tongue what they were to say in the foreign one; they planned the sentence in their mind in Hebrew, read it over, as it were, to themselves, and then sought the Greek words to turn it into Greek. Now it could not but happen sometimes that one would miss the most appropriate expression, while the other attained it, or thought he did.

All depends on the circumstance that one took pains to avoid common Hebraisms, while the other did not. It is, however, forcing the matter to an extreme, if we attempt to explain in this way all the verbal discrepancies which we meet with. Of the well-known explanations of this kind, how few are really simple, striking, and satisfactory? But even if they possessed these characteristics, and the number was much greater, their force would be only that of induction, and would rest on the following syllogism. We know, from examples, that when there are small discrepancies in expression between these writers, as soon as we turn the sentence into Hebrew or Aramæan, it is instantly plain what was the source of the difference in phraseology. Now the number of these cases is so great, that they cannot be attributed to accident, or to ingenuity on our part. We are, therefore, referred to an original Hebrew text, which was the basis of all the three Gospels.

This is a correct statement of the argument aimed at in attempts of this kind. So long as the truth of the major and middle propositions is doubtful, so long as the examples are so few in number, and so few even of these are good ones, we may regard this argument from induction as a debt, acknowledged indeed, but yet unpaid, and which probably never will be paid. Who can explain from the Hebrew, how Matthew (12: 28,) could translate *ἐν πνεύματι θεοῦ*, and Luke (11: 20,) *ἐν δακτύλῳ θεοῦ*; Matthew (7: 11,) *δώσει ἀγαθὰ*, and Luke (11: 13,) *δώσει πνεῦμα ἅγιον*; Matthew (6: 26,) *πετεινὰ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ*, and Luke (12: 24,) *τοὺς κόρακας*? Could *רַחֵם* be mistaken for *עָרַב*; *שֶׁרָחַם* for *רָחַם* for *טָבַח*; or *עָרַב שְׂמֵי* for *עָרַב שָׁמַיִם*? We will cite a few more instances of this character. Matth. 10: 29, *δύο στροuthία ἄσφαρίων πωλεῖται*, and Luke 12: 6, *πέντε στροuthία πωλεῖται ἄσφαρίων δύο*. Matth. *οὐ πεσεῖται ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν*; Luke, *οὐκ ἔστι ἐπιλελησμένον*. Matth. 23: 23, *τὸ κύμινον*; Luke 11: 42, *πᾶν λάχανον*. Matth. 23: 13, *κλείετε τὴν βασιλείαν τῶν οὐρανῶν*; Luke 11: 52, *ἤρατε τὴν κλεῖδα τῆς γνώσεως*. Matt. 5: 48, *τέλειοι*; Luke 6: 36, *οἰκτιρμονες*. Matth. 5: 4, *ὅτι αὐτοὶ παρακληθήσονται*; Luke 6: 21, *ὅτι γελάσετε*. What is the Hebrew word, in each of these cases, from which these discrepancies might have originated as two different modes of translation.

6. To support the hypothesis of an original Hebrew Gospel with its



various copies and versions, from which our Gospels are said to have originated, a prop has been used which has itself no firmness, viz. the subsidiary hypothesis that no one of the Evangelists could have seen the work of his predecessor and made use of it as the basis of his own.

What hindrance was there in the way? Did the idea of composing such a work strike all three at the same moment? and did they carry it into execution at precisely the same time? It has never entered the minds of even those who seem to occupy themselves with the invention of novel theories, to maintain this. If, however, our historians published their works at different times, must not the work of the earlier writer have been known to the later? Did Luke know of the works of *many others*, of whom he speaks in his introduction, and was he unacquainted with those of his own colleagues? Did they indeed mutually estrange themselves from each other, to such a degree as to break all social bands, while they were laboring for the preservation and extension of the same cause?

Whether they abode in the Christian countries of Asia, or in the newly converted parts of Europe, they were still in the Roman dominions, not far from the bosom of the Mediterranean Sea, the central point of all trade and intercourse. Had Rome no connexion with the two principal cities in her Asiatic possessions, Ephesus and Antioch? And were not these two cities likewise the principal seats of Christianity? Was not Corinth the theatre of all kinds of traffic and business? Did not Asiatic vessels sail to Macedonian ports, and Macedonian vessels to Asiatic ports? Had the Phœnicians ceased to frequent the sea? Were not Alexandrian vessels seen in the harbors of Asia and Italy? Then, too, Rome was the great rendezvous to which subjects resorted from all quarters of the globe to seek justice, to transact business, and to traffic in costly articles of merchandise. In behalf of this hypothesis, therefore, we should be forced to imagine a totally different world from the present; or else assert that Christians had designedly broken off all friendly relations, and were desirous to know nothing of each other.<sup>1</sup>

## § 21.

It is nevertheless insisted, that neither saw the earlier work of either of the others, and proof is offered to sustain the assertion.

There are, it is said, two alternatives possible in respect to the literal agreement of the first three Gospels. Either one of them saw and used the work of another; or else they drew in such cases from a third common source, or from several. Now the first of these alternatives, it is *ded/* continued, is not supposable; we must therefore adopt the second, with such combinations as are necessary to explain all the facts in respect to language, phraseology, and other points.

But why is not the first alternative supposable? It is replied, that these writers differ from each other in respect to circumstances, often

<sup>1</sup> Dr. Vogel notices difficulties of this kind in his essay "Ueber die Entstehung der drey erster Evangelien," in Gabler's "Journ. für auserles. theol. Litter." I. Bd. I. Stück. p. 11—25.



do not coincide as to designations of time, and even vary from each other in essential points, giving an entirely different appearance to events or discourses, and sometimes exhibiting discrepancies which border on absolute contradiction; and this could not have been the case, if one had seen the writings of the others. Sometimes, too, one is diffuse in his narration where another is concise, so that the supposition of the the latter having seen the work of the former would make him to have cast a slight, as it were, on the fuller details of his predecessors.<sup>1</sup>

These arguments, it is said, make it clear that all the positions assumed to solve the problem presented, are correct and irrefragable. Let us make trial of them in their application to two other writers; for a moment supposing ourselves uncertain as to their mutual relation. Let them be the historians Livy and Polybius. We now wish to prove that Livy did not see Polybius, and, *vice versâ*, that Polybius did not see Livy. One sometimes varies from the other as to the circumstances of events; they differ likewise as to the date of certain facts; they contain discrepancies which border on contradiction; indeed, one declares the contrary of what the other asserts; and lastly, neither has always made proper use of the more extended detail which he might have found in the other. Therefore neither knew any thing of the other; Livy knew nothing of Polybius, and Polybius nothing of Livy. Now is this true? is it perfectly correct? Livy, it is well known, expressly refers to Polybius in several books of his history.

Thus an historian may have read the work of a competitor on the same subject, and yet not have renounced his own judgment, may make use of his own special investigations, and strive to excel the previous writer by making further researches; he may have read him, and yet understand many circumstances differently, prefer another chronology in many cases, and arrange facts in another order. He may have read him, and yet vary from him; he may have read him, and yet venture to entertain a different opinion. He may sometimes be concise because he has read the work of his predecessor and has found the subject exhausted. This we might think no man ever doubted. Yet no attention has been paid to these considerations in the most recent works on this subject.

Now why should not what is acknowledged to be valid in respect to profane writers, be admitted to be applicable to the authors of the Gospels?

Why may not one of them, even if he had the work of another before him, have deviated from his predecessor? Is the reason an external one, or does it not lie wholly in the design of the Evangelists? There is no external necessity, no prohibition, in the case; this constraint must have been imposed upon them solely by a special regard to their circumstances, by a sort of mutual understanding between them.

Now such a principle would be a bad one, and is shared with them

---

<sup>1</sup> Eichhorn's *Einleit. in das neue Test.* 1Bd. § 39—45. He was preceded by Dr. Herbert Marsh in his *Notes and Additions to Michaelis' Introd.* p. 245. Germ. Edit. [2d Eng. Ed. Vol. III. P. II. p. 320, seq.] Bertholdt has treated this argument with his accustomed perspicuity in his *Hist. Krit. Einleit. in die Schriften des A. und N. T.* III. Th. § 312—319.

(if they followed it,) by no good writer. Nor is it a proper course to commence the business of investigating the sources and merits of any historian with such a supposition. We can arrive at positions of this kind only at the close of the whole investigation, and it would be bad enough then to come to such a conclusion.

Yet one cannot help suspecting sometimes that the course of recent criticism has depended on the fact, that a passage has been extracted here from Matthew and there from Mark or Luke, and then the inference made from the discrepancy between them that neither saw the other's work or he would have varied from him.

Is it meant (for we are left wholly to conjecture on this point,) that Mark could not in a particular passage have varied from Matthew, or Luke from Mark, etc., because the narrative of the latter of the two is most accurate? How can this be known beforehand, when we are but just on the point of entering upon an inquiry into their historical merits? This, again, is beginning with the assumption of something which we cannot know until the close of our investigation.

Nothing of this kind can with certainty be maintained in the outset from individual passages or detached clauses, as the variations may be occasioned by many different reasons, some of which we may not be able to perceive until we have obtained a clear understanding of the course of procedure and the habits of each writer, both separately and relatively to the rest. Now for this purpose it is essential that the plan of each of these works should be discovered, that not only the number but the scope of the different parts of the narrative should be rightly estimated, and that each writer's peculiar style of description and narration, and every one of his prominent peculiarities, should be clearly understood. When all this is accomplished, and then only, we are in a situation to pronounce which of these books bears the greatest resemblance to a first attempt; which strives most after strict precision in chronology and in the representation of circumstances; which adds to this precision a copiousness not to be found in the rest; and which has advanced nearest to perfection. Then only can we decide with certainty, that one could not have failed to make use of the work of another if he had read it. But to assume certain positions as truths at a premature stage of the investigation, and then introduce them into the inquiry as arguments, will serve any purpose rather than that of affording a just conclusion.

## § 22.

Hitherto no pains have been thought too great and no methods too various to be taken for the sake of enabling the hypothesis of an original written Gospel to keep the field. Instead of this an *oral* one is now proposed to us. Such an one was long ago thought of and written about, but excited no particular attention. The fact that the many objections to the former theory have been gradually admitted, has brought the theory of an oral Gospel into greater relief, and it has at last been clothed by Dr. Gieseler with all the attractive charms of eloquence.

He recommends the adoption of it as a simple mode of explaining the coincidences and discrepancies between our first three Gospels.<sup>1</sup>

We agree with his remarks in opposition to an original written Gospel, or as he prefers to call it written Diegesis, but are by no means so ready to admit all he has premised in order to pave the way for his own theory. In particular, we protest against the assertion that no particular succession of the four Gospels *has any historical support*. The case is not so bad as that. Could the advocates of an original Gospel, oral or written, adduce such ancient evidence and authorities in support of their positions, as we presented in the outset of this investigation (Part II. § 1.) to serve as its basis, they would hardly be content that these appearances and statements should be considered as amounting to a probable hypothesis. The absence of pretension does not detract from their value.

We will now state the principal features of the proposed hypothesis. For several years after our Lord's death, the Apostles lived together in intimacy at Jerusalem. The subject of their conversation was their glorified Master; the events of his life, as well as his discourses, were discussed by them, each in proportion to its importance considered in its bearing on the subject of a Messiah. In such discussions the memory of one was aided and corrected by that of another; and thus the events and doctrines came to be accurately understood and firmly fixed in the memory.

Now when one of the apostles in presence of the rest imparted instruction to those who were preparing to assist in preaching the gospel, what had been freely treated of in conversation received a historical form in consecutive narration. In order to prevent any distortions of facts in repeating them, the phraseology was determined, and with it likewise the thought. The apostles thus acquired a superintendence of the subject, and agreed among themselves in respect to the selection of such events as in point of dignity and other characteristics bore the stamp of the Messiah. In this way they formed a permanent doctrinal standard, which caused a uniform representation of the subjects which it treated. It comprehended the passages which are common to the first three of our Gospels.

On the other hand, narratives were delivered to the novices above-mentioned with more or less of detail according to their various shades of importance, and in unimportant narratives the phraseology was less restricted. Sometimes, too, private recollections of the apostles crept into their discourses. Hence arose sundry variations in particular parts of the account.

The *stereotype* narrative thus formed was preserved and circulated only by oral communication. It was necessary that such novices of talent as were designed for teachers should commit it to memory. It was repeated over to them until it was imprinted in their recollection.

The language at first was Aramæan; but as Hellenists, likewise,

<sup>1</sup> Historisch-kritischer Versuch über die Entstehung und frühesten Schicksale der schriftlichen Evangelien. By Dr. J. C. Gieseler. Leips. 1818.



were received into the church, the narrative was translated with the same care into Greek.

I cannot avoid repetition here and there, in calling to mind what I have before said, and in referring to positions which are subsequently, though not as yet, sustained by the requisite proof. I myself am likewise of opinion that the history of Jesus was for a long time propagated in the country where the events occurred by means of oral narration; not, however, on the part of the apostles, but the people generally. On this account the apostles appealed to the common knowledge in regard to what had happened, in order to attain their ulterior purposes without unnecessary delay. (See below, § 33.) So little had length of time been able to erase the recollection of these events from the minds of the people, that when Matthew wrote his history he could appeal to common report in behalf of what he said concerning the watch at the sepulchre. (28: 15.)

In this way the apostles gained leisure for other purposes; for inculcating the Messianic dignity of Jesus and the necessity of conversion. Nothing but the Messianic dignity would serve as authority in the eyes of the Jews for innovations in religion. The principal concern was the establishment of the new religion; the Messiahship only contained the authority for this, or the divine warrant. It was not itself the doctrine, but was the seal of the sacredness and obligatory nature of the doctrine, and it was only from accidental circumstances that it became the main idea of Matthew's book, as the prevailing idea in John's is that Jesus was the Son of God. Now although the occasion and object of the works of the other Evangelists were different, still the direction taken by the first writer had an influence on their productions; especially on that of Mark, and in a less degree on that of Luke. The evidence of this Messianic dignity was not contained in one or two facts merely, which it was necessary to relate, but in the whole life and actions of Jesus together, which were sufficiently attested by common report; e. g. in the fact that he sprang from the house of David, was born at Bethlehem, went about endued with miraculous power, healed grievous infirmities and diseases, &c. &c., and after being unjustly executed arose from the dead. To this latter circumstance alone they gave themselves as authority. The rest of the argument they made out by a comparison of the commonly known facts in the life of Jesus with the characteristics of the Messiah as stated by the prophets. In respect to the mode of teaching practised by the apostles, we refer a second time to our observations on the introduction to Luke. (§ 33.) Now let it be considered whether the supposition of an original historical Gospel, either oral or written, be compatible with this state of things.

The proof that Jesus was the Messiah, was only introductory and preparatory to his doctrines. The main thing was his system for ennobling human life and reforming the nations of the earth. „Of this very little was retained or comprehended by the common people of Palestine; for it is far easier to imprint amazing events on the recollection than words of moral wisdom. No rhapsodist could fix these in the hearts of men, by reciting narratives which he had committed to memory. It was necessary, not merely that they should be repeated to others by the preacher of the faith, but that they should be deeply imprinted



on his own mind—should fill his whole soul. He had to address men, to exhort, warn, encourage, and rebuke them. This was the *ἔργον ἐυαγγελιστοῦ*, (2 Tim. 4: 2—6,) the business of a teacher. It was no mechanical work, but one of free, voluntary action. What a superficial and derogatory idea of the task of preachers of the faith is entertained by those who make it to have consisted in declaiming a history which they had learned by heart!

Supposing the apostles to have undertaken to communicate a narrative of the life of Jesus, it would, even without intention, have been altered in its form by repeated recital. In recitation it was not incumbent on an apostle, even according to the hypothesis of Gieseler, to drive from his mind and consign to oblivion whatever his own memory suggested. It was with them as with other men; frequent repetition of the narrative must have awakened recollection of circumstances and doctrines connected with the events, recollection of what preceded, what followed, and of similar facts, according to the well-known laws of mind. In this way the history must have acquired such fulness of detail in its particular parts, and grown to such bulk as a whole, that when it became necessary to publish it in writing, it might have appeared at once as a complete work, and a second, third, and even fourth historian would have been entirely needless. If any object that the apostles had not the ability to narrate of themselves what accidentally occurred to their recollection, let them consider that an ordinary man knows how to relate what he has himself seen, and learns the narrative by heart from frequent repetition.

On the other hand, as the Messianic dignity of Jesus and his words were of chief importance, and the history of his life was never detailed, but, whenever it was necessary to make use of it, was assumed as known to the people, it could not but happen, as it did, that after the lapse of years only partial recollections, general and indefinite in respect to circumstances, would be awakened in the minds of those who undertook to write the narrative of Christ's life, and that an exact representation of facts could be recovered only gradually and by means of several writers, each stating his own impressions.

The objection against a written Gospel which we made above, (§ 20,) drawn from the life of Paul, applies likewise to an oral Diegesis. When Barnabas, and with him Paul, undertook to preach in Antioch, the former must certainly have had by heart the original Gospel, if there was any such, and Paul must have learned it from him. How, then, did it happen that Paul, after having already met with great and conscious success as an apostle in Asia Minor, felt the necessity of conferring with the apostles at Jerusalem on points of doctrine, that he might not labor in vain? (Galat. 2: 1, 2.) No hesitation on these points could well have arisen had he learned and preached an oral Gospel. Now if there was not any such standard Gospel at that time, it was not formed until it was too late.

These general arguments might perhaps suffice; but, not to dismiss the matter too hastily, we will say something further against a few essential parts of the hypothesis as it is presented.

It undertakes to explain both the coincidence and variation of the first three Gospels by the character of the oral Diegesis. To accom-

plish this the following positions are assumed : the more important parts were recounted oftener and with more precision than those which were less important ; whence arose coincidence in regard to the former while in regard to the latter more freedom was allowed the *Diegetes*. Now we might, on the contrary, cite instances in which the most important events were not recounted so often or with such precision as to preclude variation in the narrative of the Evangelists. As, however, it would be necessary first to settle the question of the importance of a particular account, we will select one which will need no previous discussion. I do not fear contradiction when I consider the resurrection as the most important event in the whole history. And this very event was not thus recounted, even in substance, still less in any precise phraseology, as is proved by the *visit of the woman to the sepulchre*. We do not deny that Jesus was often the subject of conversation among his disciples after he was glorified ; but if from their conversations a regular narrative had been gradually formed for use in preaching, the details of this part of the history would have been fixed with extreme precision while the witnesses were yet together. This was evidently not the case ; the whole was entrusted to each one's individual knowledge. Our mode of explaining the facts in the case is this : the apostles had seen and spoken with our Lord many times after he arose from the dead, and were so certain of the resurrection that they did not trouble themselves very much (at least to inform each other) in regard to the circumstances by which the fact first became known.

It is supposed that the further oral propagation (*παράδοσις*) of the *Diegesis*, which had thus originated in the conversations of the apostles, was effected in the following way. Persons were sought for who were qualified for the ministry, and were made to imprint the whole literally on the memory from hearing it frequently repeated. Were the supposition merely that a few prayers or short narratives were to be learned by heart literally, it might be reasonable ; but the case is different in respect to an entire Gospel, or the passages common to the first three Gospels, which must have formed a history, to say the least, as large as our Gospel by Mark. In such a case, there would be room for applying what was said by the head of the Spartan council to the Athenian orator : I did not comprehend the close of your speech, and, before you reached the close, I had forgotten the beginning. It must have been necessary for the learner to have heard the *Diegesis* so often and with such rigorous attention that he would have learned it ten times more easily from a written document, and for the narrator to repeat it over so often that it would have been ten times more easy for him to have dictated or written it ; so that we are left in doubt which would have been placed in the most vexatious situation by such impolitic management.

This difficulty was felt by the learned proposer of the hypothesis, and he imposed upon himself by his learning, without succeeding in justifying his supposition. The examples to which he appeals do not prove what he imagines they do. The prayers of the communion-service and the *symbolum fidei* bear no comparison with such a task ; neither do the early recollections of Irenæus. Just as little do the *Mishnaioth*, or *δευτερώσεις*, which were only single laws or short decisions of casuistical questions, particularly the decisions of Hillel, Shammai and Akiba,

and even these were written down by the pupils and afterwards committed to memory. They were collected together from such records of them by R. Judah Hakkadosh. Few decisions are of as early a date as the time of the Asmonæans. It will not be expected that we should credit the pretended traditions from Mt. Sinai. There still remain two facts, however, on which the whole matter depends. Gregory relates of the paralytic Servulus, that, though unable to read, he acquired a knowledge of the Holy Scriptures according to the measure of his ability by hearing them read. (*Homil. XV. in Evang.* § 5.) But the father says nothing about a literal commitment to memory. The passage from Augustine, and that alone, is strictly in point. He states (*De Doctr. Christ. L. I.* § 4,) that the Egyptian monk Antonius was said to have learned the Sacred Scriptures by heart, from merely hearing them (*audiendo memoriter tenuisse.*) But Augustine refers the reader to common report, (*prædicatur,*) for the truth of which he does not vouch. Commendable caution; for Antonius could not only read and write, but was even himself an author.

### § 23.

Will it be much amiss for us, after driving about a long time in the unfathomable space of conjecture, once more to plant our feet on historical ground, and, instead of devising something unreal, apply the principles of true criticism to the real facts before us? What is there then which forbids us to consider Matthew as an independent writer?

Even if the existence of some previous biography of Jesus could be rendered probable, it would not have been proved that Matthew drew from it; and still less should we be entitled to take this for granted, for that would be to doubt *whether one who was himself an eye-witness was original in the narrative he presents.*

Respecting such a doubt as this, one really knows not what to say. Once people were in the habit of thinking pretty much as follows on this subject. When phenomena of sense are in question, they rest, so far as they are considered merely as such, on the warranty of the senses; and when our own senses are not within the horizon of the phenomenon, we refer to the senses of a third person, and know that the highest proof of the existence of something perceptible is the perception of the perceiver. From this principle, it was thought, proceeded the chief rule in historical criticism, viz. that when I was not myself at the scene of the occurrences and did not receive the impression of them through my own senses, I must refer for a knowledge of them to the perception of another who was a spectator, to the eye-witness, and with him all further question in respect to historical phenomena, considered as such, is to be discontinued. Thus Matthew is to be considered as original in his narration, in every case in which he was an eye-witness.

There are, however, but few facts in his book from which history excludes him; of all that took place after he was called to be an apostle only two of which he was not a witness with others, viz. the transfiguration on the mount and the occurrence in the house of Jairus. In every other case he was *μετὰ τῶν δώδεκα*, and was as well acquainted as either of the twelve with what occurred in Galilee, to which his narra-



tive is exclusively confined, with the exception of the account of the passion, the scene of which was Jerusalem, where however he, as well as the other apostles, abode at the time.

This alone might show him to be original in his narration, viz. that his book contains nothing which did not take place while he was present or near at hand; that he does not overstep the boundaries of Galilee, his native region, leaving unnoticed all that occurred in Judea, which was at a distance from his position.

II. Were any one to seek for some remoter source of the *Memorabilia* of Socrates than Xenophon, and to boast of the following position as the sagacious result of his researches, viz. that Xenophon found these *Memorabilia* already in existence, and perhaps had the merit of improving them somewhat in point of style, or (according to another hypothesis) that he compiled them from fragmentary and detached accounts, how would such a supposition be received? He was a disciple of the celebrated philosopher, whom Socrates met and attached to himself as Jesus did Matthew. From that time forward, with the exception of a few hours when Socrates drank the cup of poison, he was an eye-witness of his actions, his companion and friend. When he communicates to us the circumstances of the philosopher's life from that period, it is necessary that we should know him to have been totally incapable of such a composition, before we can be justified in referring his narrative to any one but himself.

Just so in regard to the disciple of Jesus; it must be proved that he had not ability adequate to this production. But which of the twelve, to judge from his condition and calling, would be likely to write such a work with more facility than he? Must not a *portitor* and official receiver of the customs, who was brought by his occupation into extensive intercourse with the world, have possessed more experience in writing than fishermen and the like?

Does the production exhibit evidence of greater acquirements than we should expect him to have possessed? Does it presuppose exalted and extensive views, taste, and a classical style? With the exception of some Jewish reading, the tone of the whole of his history is that of an unlearned and artless narrative; there is exhibited a penury of language and an ignorance of its grammatical rules, and invariably the open, unpretending manner of an ordinary man, whose circumstances had learned him how to read and write.

Now, how can we be justified in passing over the eye-witness, an eye-witness capable in every respect, and going without scruple beyond the original narrator, in order to provide a source for his narrative which in itself and all its characteristics lies wholly in the region of fiction!

## § 24.

Still it is insisted that traces of such an earlier original Gospel are found, and that in the works of Justin Martyr.<sup>1</sup> As the citations of this

<sup>1</sup> J. Severin Vater has instituted a critical inquiry concerning the books proposed as the sources of our Gospels, in the following work: "*De Evangeliiis quæ ante Evangelia canonica in usu ecclesiæ Christianæ fuisse dicuntur. Re-*



father have thus become connected with the investigation in regard to the sources of the first three Gospels, we must consent to make a few remarks upon them.

Justin was in the habit of demonstrating the whole of Christianity from the Old Testament. In the Dialogue with Trypho the Jew, whom he wishes to convert, New Testament occurrences are pointed out by him in Moses and the prophets, as being all there foretold, and he then relates with freedom and in his own language the corresponding facts in the New Testament, for the purpose of comparison. But he could not proceed in this way in respect to the prophecies, the precise phraseology of which was considered and treated by the Jew as of the utmost importance, and the signification of which he took infinite pains to discover. In the one case he had to adhere to the phraseology, while in the other he related the facts, independently of the particular language of the historian.

His procedure is the same in his Larger Apology. He wishes to prove to the Roman people, that everything respecting Jesus and his fortunes was predicted in the prophets, and enters into protracted explanations in regard to these Jewish oracles. For he, as well as his pupil Tatian, entertained the idea that all the knowledge of Thales, Socrates, Plato, and other ancient philosophers, was only borrowed from Moses and the sacred books of the Jews; and of this they both attempted to convince the Greeks and Romans in works written expressly for the purpose, the former in his *Λόγος παραινετικός πρὸς Ἕλληνας*, the latter in an address entitled simply *Πρὸς Ἕλληνας*. Whenever in the Apology of Justin the doctrines of Christianity and the history of its founder were mentioned, they were presented by him in his own style of narrative, without strict adherence to the phraseology of the historical books, and frequently in a purer diction.

We shall be completely convinced that he has taken great license in citing from the New Testament, if we compare with each other such passages as are twice quoted in his works. In the 17th chapter of the Dialogue with Trypho, he quotes thus: *γίγραται . . . οὐαὶ ὑμῖν γραμματεῖς καὶ Φαρισαῖοι, ἰποκριταί, ὅτι ἀποδεκατοῦτε τὸ ἡδύσμον, καὶ τὸ πῆγανον, τὴν δὲ ἀγάπην τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ τὴν κρίσιν οὐ κατανόεῖτε. Ταφοὶ κεκονιαμένοι, ἔξωθεν φαινόμενοι ὠραῖοι, ἔσωθεν δὲ γέμοντες ὀστέων νεκρῶν. Καὶ τοῖς γραμματεῦσιν, οὐαὶ ὑμῖν γραμματεῖς, ὅτι τὰς κλεῖς ἔχετε, καὶ αὐτοὶ οὐκ εἰσέρχεσθε, καὶ τοὺς εἰσερχομένους κωλύετε, ὁδοὶ τυφλοὶ.* In the same work, 112th chapter, he cites these words thus: *ἔφη ὁ ἡμέτερος κύριος . . . τάφοι κεκονιαμένοι, ἔξωθεν φαινόμενοι ὠραῖοι, καὶ ἔσωθεν γέμοντες ὀστέων νεκρῶν, τὸ ἡδύσμον ἀποδεκατοῦντες, τὴν δὲ ἀμῆλῳ καταπίνοντες, τυφλοὶ ὁδοὶ.* In the 35th chapter of this Dialogue he quotes thus: *εἶπε . . . ἀναστήσονται πολλοὶ ψευδόχριστοι καὶ ψευδοπροφῆται, καὶ πολλοὺς τῶν πιστῶν πλανήσουσι;* but in the 82d chap. *εἶπε . . . ὅτι ψευδοπροφῆται καὶ ψευδόχριστοι πολλοὶ ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματί μου παρελεύσονται, καὶ πολλοὺς πλανήσουσι.* In his Larger Apology, 16th chapter, *πολλοὶ ἐροῦσί μοι, κύριε, κύριε, οὐ τῷ σῷ ὀνόματι ἐτάχμεν καὶ ἐπόμεν*

giomont. 1812." 4to., to which I refer the rather because this learned man has reviewed with acknowledged ability all those hypotheses which my plan would not permit me to notice.

καὶ δυνάμεις ἐποιήσαμεν, καὶ τότε ἐρῶ αὐτοῖς ἀποχωρεῖτε ἀπ' ἐμοῦ ἐργάται τῆς ἀνομίας; and in his Dialogue, chapter 76, καὶ πολλοὶ ἐροῦσί μοι, κύριε, κύριε, ἐν τῷ σῶ ὀνόματι ἐράγομεν, καὶ ἐπίομεν, καὶ προσεφετεύσαμεν καὶ δαιμόνια ἐξεβάλομεν. Καὶ ἐρῶ αὐτοῖς ἀποχωρεῖτε ἀπ' ἐμοῦ. In the Apology, chapter 15, καὶ τὸν ἥλιον αὐτοῦ ἀνατέλλει ἐπὶ ἀμαρτωλοὺς καὶ δικαίους καὶ πονηροὺς; in his Dialogue, chapter 96, the same passage, : τὸν τὸν ἥλιον αὐτοῦ ἀνατέλλοντα ἐπὶ ἀγαρίστους καὶ δικαίους, καὶ βρέχοντα ἐπὶ ὁσίους καὶ πονηροὺς. In the Apology, chapter 16, καὶ προσέλθοντος αὐτῷ τινος, καὶ εἰπόντος, διδάσκαλε ἀγαθὲ, ἀπεκρίνατο λέγων, οὐδεὶς ἀγαθός, εἰ μὴ ὁ μόνος ὁ Θεός, ὁ ποιήσας τὰ πάντα; in the Dialogue, chapter 101, λέγοντος αὐτῷ τινος, διδάσκαλε ἀγαθὲ, ἀπεκρίνατο, τί με λέγεις ἀγαθόν, εἰς ἐστὶν ἀγαθός, ὁ πατὴρ μου, ὁ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς.

The passages here adduced are sufficient to prove that Justin did not maintain uniformity in all his works, nor even in the same work, in respect to his citations from the New Testament; that he only confined himself to the sense, often with very little anxiety about the expression, though introducing some individual words employed in the New Testament; that he united together separate and distinct clauses, and arranged them sometimes in one order and sometimes in another, according to his fancy or as best suited his purpose.

Whoever desires to see a more extended example of his free style of narration may find one further on in the Appendix respecting the genuineness of the first two chapters of Matthew, § 74.

Now it is certainly true, that if we bring together all such citations, with the supposition that they were made literally, and, when they are inconsistent with each other, overlook the circumstance, and perhaps consider those which evince most license as the true text, and, moreover, admit the assertion that they were all taken from a single book, and unite them together accordingly, we shall obtain in this way a book which bears resemblance sometimes to one and sometimes to another of our first three Gospels, and is identical with neither.

To this book, thus happily discovered, the priority is now boldly given, and then it is clear that the citations of Justin, even when they agree literally with one of our Gospels, were not taken from them, but that of necessity our Evangelists borrowed from this earlier book or original Gospel those sentences and passages in which we sometimes find a substantial and even literal agreement with Justin's work. This is nearly the process by which this discovery has been attained; these are the strict critical principles by which its accuracy is placed beyond doubt.

The passages before compared with each other may determine whether we can acknowledge as correct the position on which the whole matter rests, viz. that Justin has always cited his notices of the life of Jesus in a strictly literal manner. What, therefore, is the fate of the whole series of conclusions deduced from this, needs no further elucidation.

Here we might stop, and consider that we had done all which could be required of us in a polemical point of view; yet some may perhaps desire a few further observations in addition to the requisite refutation.

Justin calls the sources from which he derived the acts and doctrines of Jesus, ἀπομνημονεύματα, on account of a partiality for the term,

which he acquired from the Platonic school to which he once belonged. He should, to be sure, have called them ἀπομνημονεύματα Χριστοῦ, as Xenophon's ἀπομνημονεύματα obtained from the person who was the subject of the narrative the title ἀπομνημονεύματα Σωκράτους. Justin, however, derives their name from the writers who composed them, and calls them invariably ἀπομνημονεύματα τῶν ἀποστόλων. He expresses himself very clearly on this point in his Dialogue, chap. 88, ὡς περισσεύει τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα ἐπιπιῆναι ἐπ' αὐτόν, ἔγραψαν οἱ ἀπόστολοι αὐτοῦ τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἡμῶν. He here evidently recognises several authors.

Instead of this expression he sometimes, moreover, uses the term Gospel in the singular number: *it is written in the Gospel*, and, as his opponent expresses himself in the Dialogue: *in the so-called Gospel*, ἐν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ γέγραπται—ἐν τῷ λεγομένῳ εὐαγγελίῳ. (chaps. 10 and 100.) He probably, however, speaks in accordance with the custom of the fathers of the 2d and 3d centuries, who considered the works of the four Evangelists as only one Gospel; for though distinguished indeed as respects their authors, they are not as to their subject, and hence are only ἐν εὐαγγέλιον διὰ τεσσάρων or a τετράμορφον εὐαγγέλιον ἐν ἐνὶ πνεύματι, *quadriforme evangelium in uno spiritu* etc. (Comp. Part I. § 47.)

In another place he is still more clear on this point. In his Larger Apology he speaks of the Gospels in the plural number, (chap. 67.) οἱ ἀπόστολοι ἐν τοῖς γενομένοις ὑπ' αὐτῶν ἀπομνημονεύμασι, ἃ καλεῖται εὐαγγέλια, οὕτως παρέδωκαν. As the expression τὰ εὐαγγέλια, the Gospels, was never used in ancient or modern times in speaking of but one book, it is here decisive of the fact that Justin not only knew of several different writers, but of several different works with this title.

The expression, ἀπομνημονεύματα τῶν ἀποστόλων, occurs about fourteen times in Justin's citations. On one occasion he uses a remarkable variation from this expression, where he mentions the change of Peter's name and those of Zebedee's children: "this," says he, "is written in his (i. e. Peter's) memoirs," ἐν τοῖς ἀπομνημονεύμασιν αὐτοῦ. He had already spoken of Peter's change of name, (*Dial. c. 100.*) referring simply to the ἀπομνημονεύματα τῶν ἀποστόλων, in which it was related that Jesus gave Simon the surname of Peter, after he had acknowledged him to be the son of God. When, however, he mentions the sons of Zebedee likewise, who were surnamed sons of thunder, he changes the form of citation and observes: *this is stated in his* (Peter's) *memoirs.* (*Dial. c. 106.*)

He thus clearly distinguishes the memoirs of Peter from those of other apostles, and, as we have already observed, (§ 14.) the account of the sons of thunder is to be found only in Mark, whose book, as far as respected those parts of the history which were peculiar to it alone, was referred by the ancients wholly to Peter.

Among his citations there is another case in which he gives a particular explanation of his usual form of citation. He refers as usual to the ἀπομνημονεύματα, but extends the adjunct ἀποστόλων, which he always subjoins, by saying that they were composed by the apostles and those ἐκείνους παρακολουθησάντων, who were their companions in



the business of teaching: ἐν γὰρ τοῖς ἀπομνημονεύμασιν, ἃ γημι ὑπὸ τῶν ἀποστόλων αὐτοῦ καὶ τῶν ἐκείνους παρακολουθήσαντων συντετάχθαι, ὅτι ἰδρῶς ὡσεὶ θρόμβοι κατεχεῖτο αὐτοῦ εὐχομένου κ. τ. λ. Now who were the παρακολουθήσαντες? On this point we are not left in the dark: according to the ancients, Mark was the ἀκόλουθος, ἑρμηνεύς, or *sectator Petri*, and Luke, likewise, an ἀκόλουθος, *comes, sectator apostoli*. Thus what Justin says of the memoirs, that they were composed by apostles and their companions, exactly applies to our Gospels. And it further deserves special notice, that in this passage in which Justin subjoins the explanation that the ἀπομνημονεύματα were not written by the apostles only, but by their companions likewise, he cites from one of these companions, viz. Luke, the words: ἰδρῶς ὡσεὶ θρόμβοι κατεχεῖτο αὐτοῦ εὐχομένου. (22: 44. *Dial. c.* 103.)

These ἀπομνημονεύματα, then, were not by one individual; they were several Gospels written by apostles and companions of apostles, as is the case with our own. When Justin mentions Peter's memoirs, he quotes Mark; when he mentions the companions of the Apostles, in reference to these memoirs, he quotes a passage from Luke. Matthew we shall discover in his other citations.

He in one place refers to his former declarations concerning the Logos, of whom he often speaks, and says in his free manner that the only-begotten of the Father, the Logos who proceeded from him, afterwards became man, *as we learn from the memoirs, ἀπὸ τῶν ἀπομνημονευμάτων.*<sup>1</sup> The λόγος, the μονογενής, the ἄνθρωπος γενόμενος is

<sup>1</sup> *Dial. cum Tryph. c.* 105. Μονογενὴς γὰρ ὅτι ἦν τῷ πατρὶ τῶν ὅλων οὗτος, ἰδίως ἐξ αὐτοῦ λόγος καὶ δύναμις γενόμενος, καὶ ὕστερον ἄνθρωπος διὰ τῆς παρθένου γενόμενος, ὥς ἀπὸ τῶν ἀπομνημονευμάτων ἐμάθομεν, προεδήλωσα.

The question respecting Justin's memoirs may be regarded as settled by the careful investigation of an estimable scholar, Geo. Ben. Winer in his *Einladung ad orationem muneris adeundi causa*. Erlang. 1819. "Justinum M. Evangeliiis canonicis usum fuisse ostenditur." Appropriate remarks on this subject may be found in Dr. J. P. Mynster's work: "Ueber den Gebrauch unserer Evangelien in den Schriften Justins des M. Koph. 1819." In this work, however, he does not confine himself to the Gospels, but shows that Justin made use of other writings of the New Testament, and among other cases, notwithstanding the freedom of his manner, we can recognise 2 Thess. 2: 3, in Tryph. ch. 110. ὅταν καὶ ὁ τῆς ἀποστάσεως ἄνθρωπος κ. τ. λ.; Coloss. 1. 15. πρωτότοκος πάσης κτίσεως, Tryph. ch. 138, and Gal. 4: 12. 5: 20, 21. ad Græc. Orat. near the end.—Herm. Olshausen has in a general manner pointed out our Gospels in Justin's citations in "Die Echtheit der vier kanonischen Evangelien. Königsb. 1823." p. 286 seq. Yet he has made too little account of Justin's license in using the Gospels, which is undeniably clear whenever he cites the same passage two or three times; and on the other hand he attributes too much to the corruption of Mss. In supposing from the resemblance of a few expressions that Justin made use of the Jewish Gospel likewise, (p. 329,) he was preceded by Dr. Paulus in the "Theol. exeg. Conversatorium," I. Lief., "Über die Entstehungsart der drey ersten Evangelien." "Ob das Evangelium Justins des M. das Evangelium der Hebräer gewesen sey." Heidelb. 1822. p. 52 seq. Though I am forced to be very concise, it will be of use to clear up a passage in Justin from which inferences have been frequently made, but which is constantly misunderstood. The mistake originates in the punctuation. At chapter 98 of the *Dial. cum Tryph.* Justin begins to comment on Psalm XXI, (Heb. Ps. XXII,) and proceeds verse by verse to explain the whole of Christ. In chap. 106 he comes to verse 23d: δηγήσομαι τὸ ὄνομα σου τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς μου, ἐν μέσῳ ἐκκλησίας ἐμνήσω σε, and his explanation of it extends from ἐν μέσῳ τῶν ἀδελφῶν (i. e. τῶν ἀποστόλων,) as far as



described with sufficient distinctness in the Memoirs which we have by John. With this should be connected a passage to which Dr. Paulus and Dr. Mynster have referred. After Justin has in his manner conducted through some chapters an argument from the Old Testament against Trypho in respect to the existence of an *ἐκ θεοῦ γεγεννημένη δύναμις λογική*, who is called *θεός, κυριος, and λόγος*, (ch. 61, and 62,) he asserts (ch. 63,) that his blood was not formed from the seed of men, *τοῦ αἵματος αὐτοῦ οὐκ ἐξ ἀνθρωπείου σπέρματος—ἀλλ' ἐκ θελήματος θεοῦ*; in which we may recognise the words of John 1: 13, though the application is forced. After thus deducing the original memoir we can more easily recognise: *καὶ υἱός, ὁ λόγος—σαρκοποιηθεὶς ἄνθρωπος γέγονεν*. (Larger Apol. ch. 32.) And *ὁ λόγος—ὅτε τὴν ἀρχὴν δι' αὐτοῦ πάντα ἐκτίσεν*. (Second Apol. ch. 6.)

The fragment from the conversation with Nicodemus, (John 3: 3 seq. Larger Apol. ch. 61.) which was pointed out by Lardner, no one can fail to recognise, except intentionally.

### § 25.

We may then peaceably recur to our old position, viz. that Matthew was an original writer, and Mark copied from him; but the peculiar plan and purposes of the latter, and the mode in which he availed himself of his predecessor's work can be unfolded only in the progress of our investigation. They agree together in their selection of facts, for the most part likewise in their arrangement of them, in phraseology, and, moreover, in dividing all the acts of Jesus, related by them after his return from the temptation, into *four journeys* which he took from the place of his abode into various regions, exclusive of his last journey to the place of his passion.

We will try what information we can derive from a more extended consideration of these journeys.

### FIRST JOURNEY.

#### *Matthew.*

I. Jesus heals a leper with the injunction that he should tell no man.

II. He is met by the Centurion, whose servant he heals.

III. He enters Peter's house.

#### *Mark.*

I. Jesus enters the synagogue at Capernaum, and cures a man possessed with a devil.

II. He enters Peter's house.

---

*ὅτε ἐστρανώθη*. Then begins a new sentence in which he proves from the memoirs that *ὑμνήσω* *σε* applies to Christ, for he sang with his disciples while he lived: *καὶ μετ' αὐτῶν διάγων, ὑμνησε τὸν Θεόν, ὡς ἐν τοῖς ἀπομνημονεύμασι*; which is true; see Matth. 26: 30, *καὶ ὑμνησάντες ἐξῆλθον*. Perhaps I may have occasion to speak further of Justin.

*Matthew.**Mark.*

IV. A certain scribe desires to follow Jesus, and is sent away.

V. Jesus enters the country of the Gadarenes, heals two possessed with devils, and returns.

*ἦλθεν εἰς τὴν ἰδίαν πόλιν.*  
(Matth. 9: 1.)

III. He heals a leper with the injunction that he should tell no man.

*Πάλιν εἰσῆλθεν εἰς Καπερναοὺμ.*  
(Mark 2: 1.)

## SECOND JOURNEY.

*Matthew.**Mark.*

I. Four men bring to Jesus one sick of the palsy.

II. Jesus calls Matthew.

III. The disciples of John fast; those of Jesus do not.

IV. Jesus heals the daughter of Jairus, and a woman who had an issue of blood.

V. Jesus chooses himself disciples and sends them forth.

VI. John sends his disciples to inquire of Jesus.

VII. Jesus goes through the corn with his disciples.

*Καὶ μεταβὰς ἐκεῖθεν, ἦλθεν εἰς τὴν συναγωγὴν αὐτῶν.*  
(Matth. 12: 9.)

I. Four men bring to Jesus one sick of the palsy.

II. Jesus calls Matthew.

III. The disciples of John fast; those of Jesus do not.

IV. Jesus goes through the corn with his disciples.

*Καὶ εἰσῆλθε πάλιν εἰς τὴν συναγωγὴν.*  
(Mark 3: 1.)

## THIRD JOURNEY.

*Matthew.**Mark.*

I. A man with a withered hand is healed.

II. Jesus is said to heal through Beelzebub.

III. The scribes and Pharisees require a sign.

IV. The mother and brethren of Jesus arrive.

V. Jesus teaches in parables.

I. A man with a withered hand is healed.

II. Jesus chooses himself disciples.

III. He is said to heal through Beelzebub.

IV. The mother and brethren of Jesus arrive.

V. Jesus teaches in parables.

VI. Jesus comes into the country of the Gadarenes, and heals one possessed with a devil.

*Matthew.*

*Ἐλθὼν εἰς τὴν πατρίδα αὐτοῦ.*  
(Matth. 13: 54.)

*Mark.*

VII. Jesus heals the daughter of Jairus, and the woman with the issue of blood.

*Ἐλθεν εἰς τὴν πατρίδα.*  
(Mark 6: 1.)

The difference between Mark and Matthew in these three Journeys, arises mostly from the different positions assigned by them to the entrance into the country of the Gadarenes; Matthew placing it at the close of the first excursion, and Mark at the close of the third. If we take it out of its place in Matthew, and give it the position it has in Mark, and then set aside the events No. II and IV, which Mark has omitted to mention in any part of his book, the first Journey is the same in both.

In the second Journey they coincide, except as respects the events Matth. IV, V, VI. This difference, likewise, depends in part on the difference in regard to the voyage to Gadaris. For in both, the story of the daughter of Jairus is so placed, as to show that the incident occurred not long after this voyage. As Matthew places this at the end of the first, and Mark at the end of the third Journey, the event which took place not long after the voyage is likewise differently placed in both. Mark is wholly silent respecting the inquiry made by John's disciples. If now we remove No. V. in Matthew further along into the third journey, there is a perfect coincidence between the two writers.

## FOURTH JOURNEY.

*Matthew.*

I. The prophet is without honor in his own country.

II. Herod believes that John has risen from the dead.

III. Five thousand are fed.

IV. Jesus walks on the sea, appears upon it to the apostles, and goes to Gennesaret.

V. The disciples of Jesus eat with unwashen hands.

VI. Jesus goes into the region of Tyre: story of the woman of Canaan.

VII. Four thousand are fed.

VIII. A sign is demanded of Jesus.

IX. The apostles forget to take bread with them.

*Mark.*

I. The prophet is without honor in his own country.

II. Jesus sends forth his disciples.

III. Herod believes that John has risen from the dead.

IV. The disciples of Jesus return from their mission.

V. Five thousand are fed.

VI. Jesus walks on the sea, appears upon it to the apostles, and goes to Gennesaret.

VII. The disciples of Jesus eat with unwashen hands.

VIII. Jesus goes into the region of Tyre: story of the woman of Canaan.

IX. Four thousand are fed.

X. A sign is demanded of Jesus.

XI. The apostles forget to take bread with them.

*Matthew.**Mark.*

X. Jesus asks : Whom do men say that I am ?

XI. Transfiguration on the mount.

XII. The apostles cannot heal a man possessed of a devil.

*Ἐλθόντων δὲ αὐτῶν εἰς Καπερναοῦμ.* (Matthew 17: 24.)

XII. A blind man is brought to Jesus at Bethsaida.

XIII. Jesus asks : Whom do men say that I am ?

XIV. Transfiguration on the mount.

XV. The apostles cannot heal a man possessed of a devil.

*Καὶ ἦλθεν εἰς Καπερναοῦμ.* (Mark 9: 33.)

In this Journey Mark varies from Matthew in separating the sending away of the disciples from their election, with which it is connected by Matthew, as represented in No. V. of the second Journey. Mark makes the former an independent event, and then after an interval informs us particularly of their return and what they had done. Indeed Matthew seems to have connected these events more on account of their relationship, than from regard to chronological order.

Matthew, moreover, has twice related the fact that certain persons desired of Jesus a sign, here and in the third Journey No. III. Mark has omitted it the first time and mentioned it only here. The event No. XII in Mark, is peculiar to him, not being found anywhere in Matthew.

Such is their coincidence up to the history of the passion, which begins at this point in both books. When Jesus departed from Capernaum the next time, he went to meet his death.

## § 26.

Now why did Mark treat the order of events in his predecessor's work with so much freedom, and in several instances follow a different arrangement ? There must have been an object and reason for this procedure, for it could only have been from design that an occurrence was removed from its position and placed in a different connexion.

How, e. g., could it happen that he should have disjoined and distinguished as two separate occurrences the selection of the apostles and their being sent forth into the world, presenting the latter in a totally different connexion, although they are united in Matthew, unless for the sake of observing their natural order and arranging them as they actually took place ?

He was still more precise : a part of the discourse, which, according to Matthew, Jesus then made to his disciples, he separates from the rest, and does not introduce till the time when Jesus, before his death, discloses to his disciples their future fate. The passage alluded to is the following :



## Matth. X. 19 seq.

Ὅταν δὲ παραδιδῶσιν ὑμᾶς,  
 μὴ μεριμνήσητε  
 πῶς ἢ τί λαλήσητε·  
 δοθήσεται γὰρ ὑμῖν  
 ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ᾠρᾷ,  
 τί λαλήσετε·  
 οὐ γὰρ ὑμεῖς ἐστε οἱ λαλοῦντες,  
 ἀλλὰ τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ πατρὸς  
 ὑμῶν,  
 τὸ λαλοῦν ἐν ὑμῖν.  
 Παραδώσει δὲ ἀδελφὸς ἀδελφὸν  
 εἰς θάνατον,  
 καὶ πατὴρ τέκνον·  
 καὶ ἐπαναστήσονται τέκνα  
 ἐπὶ γονεῖς  
 καὶ θανατώσουσιν αὐτούς.  
 Καὶ ἔσεσθε μισούμενοι  
 ὑπὸ πάντων, διὰ τὸ ὄνομά μου·  
 ὁ δὲ ὑπομείνας εἰς τέλος,  
 οὗτος σωθήσεται.

## Mark XIII. 11 seq.

Ὅταν δὲ ἀγάγωσιν ὑμᾶς  
 παραδιδόντες,  
 μὴ προμεριμνᾶτε  
 τί λαλήσητε,  
 μηδὲ μελετᾶτε· ἀλλ' ὃ ἐὰν δοθῇ ὑμῖν  
 ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ᾠρᾷ,  
 τοῦτο λαλεῖτε·  
 οὐ γὰρ ἐστε ὑμεῖς οἱ λαλοῦντες,  
 ἀλλὰ τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον.  
 Παραδώσει δὲ ἀδελφὸς ἀδελφὸν  
 εἰς θάνατον,  
 καὶ πατὴρ τέκνον·  
 καὶ ἐπαναστήσονται τέκνα  
 ἐπὶ γονεῖς  
 καὶ θανατώσουσιν αὐτούς·  
 καὶ ἔσεσθε μισούμενοι  
 ὑπὸ πάντων, διὰ τὸ ὄνομά μου·  
 ὁ δὲ ὑπομείνας εἰς τέλος,  
 οὗτος σωθήσεται.

We see that the discourse is the same in both, and the phraseology almost entirely. Now what could have induced Mark to take these words from their connexion in Matthew and place them elsewhere, except the intention of giving them their proper chronological position? Considering their purport, they certainly stand in a more appropriate connexion in Mark than in Matthew.

Mark has taken single sentences from the sermon on the mount as given in Matthew and connected them with other occasions, events and discourses; e. g. Matth. 6: 14. Mark 11: 25, 26. Matth. 5: 15. Mark 4: 21. Matth. 5: 13. Mark 9: 50. Matth. 7: 2. Mark 4: 24. This attention and care in giving single sentences of this sermon another situation, cannot be better explained than by supposing him to have aimed at relating every thing in the order in which it occurred, while, on the contrary, Matthew has given at the outset of Jesus' ministry in a systematic form and at one view what our Lord may have uttered on the most various occasions.

This purpose of our author is clearly manifest in the case of the voyage to Gadaris, as well as other cases. Matthew mentions this at the end of the first Journey, while by Mark it is removed along to the end of the third. The latter affixes to the occurrence a definite determination of time, which makes it clear that he designed to adhere to the chronological order. Jesus taught by the sea-shore in parables, and a great multitude surrounded him. (Mark 4: 1.) After the conclusion of this discourse in parables, he adds (Mark 4: 35,) that the passage over to Gadaris took place ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ, ὁπώρας γενομένης, at evening on the same day. Now it is true that the expression ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ in the Evangelists is indefinite, but the annexed no-

tice of the particular part of the day, *ὥρα*, shows that we are to take the passage as an accurate designation of time. The circumstance that Jesus was withdrawn from the multitude and carried over in a ship (4: 36,) proves the connexion of the passage across with the event immediately preceding, viz. the instruction given by Jesus in parables to the multitude by the sea-side.

In the second Journey, after the voyage to Gadaris, Matthew narrates without any definite designation of time, (when he has related a few other occurrences,) the cure of the daughter of Jairus and the woman with the issue of blood. (9: 18.) Mark, who refers them to the close of the third excursion, designates with precision the time when they occurred and their connexion, asserting that they occurred directly after the voyage to Gadaris, by saying that the father of the child came to Jesus when they had landed on their return, etc. (5: 21, 22.)

We hence perceive that he took the actual succession of things as his guide in the plan of his history, and distributed events according to their chronological order.

### § 27.

Moreover, he differs from his predecessor in his mode of representing occurrences; he is almost always more copious as to the particular circumstances attending each event. From this exactness and attention to minute points his narrative is more complete and vivid. E. g. Matthew relates the story of the woman who had an issue of blood, rather in the style of a summary than of a regular narrative: "A woman which was diseased with an issue of blood twelve years, came behind him and touched the hem of his garment; for she said within herself, If I may but touch his garment, I shall be whole. But Jesus turned him about; and, when he saw her, he said, Daughter, be of good comfort; thy faith hath made thee whole." Mark, on the contrary, takes note of the minutest circumstances. He was better acquainted with the condition and wretchedness of the diseased woman. During twelve years all the art of physicians had been exerted for her relief to no purpose, she had wasted all her substance, and her sufferings were evidently increasing; which latter circumstance essentially enhances the wonder, as well as the beneficence, of so speedy a cure. She heard of Jesus, and, approaching him behind in the crowd, touched his garment, fully convinced that she should be healed. Our Lord, perceiving that virtue had gone out of him, turned about and said: "Who touched my clothes?" The disciples replied, affirming the impossibility of determining when there was such a press of people. But Jesus merely looked around, and his glance fell on the woman, who felt already what was done in her, and immediately threw herself with fear and trembling at Jesus' feet, and told all as it happened. Jesus said unto her: "Daughter, thy faith hath made thee whole."

It is so in a greater or less degree in regard to most of the occurrences related; not that they are paraphrased, but clothed with the particular circumstances under which they occurred; e. g. Mark 1: 40—end. Matth. 8: 2—5. Mark 2: 2—13. Matth. 9: 2—9. Mark 4: 35—end. Matth. 8: 23—28. Mark 5: 1—20. Matth. 8: 28—end. Mark 6: 14—30.

Matth. 14: 6—13. Mark 12: 28—35. Matth. 22: 34—41, and many other passages.

The knowledge he possesses in regard to the persons mentioned in the history and their circumstances is worthy of notice. While Matthew (9: 18) speaks only of an *ἄρχων*, his name, Jairus, is given in Mark (5: 22) together with his office, *εἷς τῶν ἀρχισυναγῶγων*. When Matthew (15: 22) mentions generally a *γυνὴ Λαβαναία*, Mark tells us more particularly *ἦν δὲ ἡ γυνὴ Ἑλληνὶς, Συροφονικισσα τῷ γένει* (7: 26.) Matthew (27: 16) designates Barabbas simply as *δέσμιον ἐπίσημον*; Mark (15: 7) knew what was his crime, *ἐν τῇ στάσει φόνον*. The former tells us merely of a Cyrenian, Simon by name (27: 32;) while Mark informs us that it was Simon, a Cyrenian, the father of Alexander and Rufus (15: 21.) The one speaks (27: 57) of a rich man, Joseph of Arimathea; the other knew that he was a distinguished member of the council (15: 43—45,) and was acquainted with what passed between him and Pilate, and the inquiry made of the centurion by the Prætor. Concerning Mary of Magdalene, he adds the circumstance (16: 9) *ἀπ' ἧς ἐκβεβλήκει ἐπὶ δαιμόνια*. A case of the same kind, as we shall see directly, occurs in 10: 46, respecting the blind man in the road near Jericho. We will add one more example of the minute circumstances stated by Mark: according to Matth. 16: 5, the disciples had forgotten to take bread with them; yet Mark says (8: 14) they had *one loaf* with them in the ship. It is remarkable, too, that in narrating the occurrence at Gadaris, he observes (5: 13) that there were about two thousand swine.

He did not then copy Matthew's book, but made use of it as the basis of his own; conferred greater particularity on Matthew's narrative, (which frequently presents only the outline of an occurrence, neglecting circumstantial detail,) and moulded his predecessor's sketches into the form of complete history. He is not, as some have repeated from Augustine, the epitomist, but the reviser of Matthew; and sometimes his revision is so rigid that he seems positively to contradict him.

Matthew mentions two demoniacs at Gadaris, while Mark (5: 2 seq.) speaks of but one. While Matthew (20: 30) speaks of two blind men healed on the road to Jericho, Mark tells us of but one (10: 46;) and that the narrative of both has reference to the same event is clear as well from the time, as from the similarity of the circumstances and phraseology. In this last case, Mark even sustains his statement in a striking manner, by subjoining something from which it is clear that he was perfectly well informed in regard to the incident; for the name of the man who was healed is stated by him in two languages, the Greek and the Syriac: *υἱὸς Τιμαίου, Βαρτίμαιος ὁ τυφλός*.

These cases would be indeed real contradictions, if we did not know the aim of Matthew; but when this is considered, they only evince indifference as to things not connected with his purpose. (§ 4.) He wished merely to show from the acts of Jesus that he was the Messiah, and a perfectly accurate chronology was not even consistent with his plan. Minuteness, too, was of no importance to his object. The outline of an event was enough for his argument; and hence he proceeds in so summary a manner that it is evident he did not wish to trouble himself about minute circumstances. This does not prove any deficiency in

point of ability or in point of uprightness and love of truth; and only the want of one or the other of these characteristics, and not a mere indifference as to matters that do not concern his proposed plan, can brand a writer with error and dishonesty.

### § 28.

The person who is designated by history as Mark's voucher and source of information, and by whose assistance he has furnished us with so many new and important observations on Matthew, is prominently indicated as such in his work. On occasion of the first alteration which he makes in the arrangement of certain acts of our Lord, when he excludes from its position the story of the centurion, and places an incident previously mentioned by Matthew, viz. the cure of the leper, after the visit to Peter's house, he informs us just before this last occurrence that Simon was there with Jesus (Mark 1: 36,) *καὶ κατεδίωξαν αὐτὸν ὁ Σίμων καὶ οἱ μετ' αὐτοῦ*. Again, in giving a considerably extended account of the cure of the daughter of Jairus, he expressly adds the circumstance that Jesus admitted only Peter, John and James as witnesses of the whole occurrence. (5: 37.) Matthew (21. 18 seq.) relates the story of the withered fig-tree; Mark (11: 12—15 and 20—27) gives it to us more in detail, and connects some moral instruction with it, particularly a passage from the sermon on the mount. (Matt. 6: 14, 15.) He seems here, too, to substantiate his account by exhibiting Peter, respecting whom Matthew is silent, as the occasion of the dialogue and the instruction annexed. Mark (13: 3) expressly names Peter as one of the persons engaged in the conversation concerning the final fate of the temple and Holy City, while Matthew (24: 3) only mentions it generally without specifying either of the persons concerned in it. Matthew (28: 10) tells us of the command to the women to carry the news of the resurrection to the disciples; Mark (16: 7) expressly adds the name of Peter: *τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ καὶ τῷ Πέτρῳ*.

Such care to insert Peter's name in particular passages, where it was neither required by the circumstances of the event, nor any light was thereby thrown upon the event in itself considered, as in Mark 1: 36. 5: 37. 13: 3. 16: 7, denotes a peculiar motive in the writer's mind. The invariable presence of this apostle, and the mention of him purposely when it contributed nothing to illustrate the narrative, can be intended only to accredit it by his authority. At all events, Mark's anxiety to add Peter's name, without any necessity in reference to the circumstantiality or perspicuity of the occurrence, is perfectly explained by the accounts of the ancients concerning Mark's authority; and these traces in the book agree so well with the accounts as to favor and enhance their claim to credit.

### § 29.

Although in general Mark has carried out Matthew's history into more minute and exact detail than Matthew, yet in some cases he has done the contrary, and condensed Matthew's narrative, sometimes even retaining in part the same language.



## Matth. 10: 11 seq.

Εἰς ἣν δ' ἂν  
 πόλιν ἢ κώμην  
 εἰσέλθῃτε,  
 ἐξετάσατε, τίς ἐν αὐτῇ ἄξιός ἐστι·  
 καὶ κεῖ μένετε,  
 ἕως ἂν ἐξέλθῃτε.  
 Εἰσερχόμενοι δὲ εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν,  
 ἀσπάσασθε αὐτήν. Καὶ ἐὰν μὲν  
 ᾗ ἡ οἰκία ἁγία, . . . κ. τ. λ.  
 Καὶ ὅς ἐὰν μὴ δέξῃται ὑμᾶς,  
 μηδὲ ἀκούσῃ  
 τοὺς λόγους  
 ὑμῶν,  
 ἐξερχόμενοι  
 τῆς οἰκίας ἢ τῆς πόλεως  
 ἐκείνης,  
 ἐκτινάξατε τὸν κονιορτὸν  
 τῶν ποδῶν ὑμῶν.

## Mark 6: 10 seq.

Ὅπου ἐὰν  
 εἰσέλθῃτε  
 εἰς οἰκίαν,  
 ἐκεῖ μένετε  
 ἕως ἂν ἐξέλθῃτε  
 ἐκεῖθεν.  
 Καὶ ὅσοι ἂν μὴ δέξωνται ὑμᾶς  
 μηδὲ ἀκούσωσιν  
 ὑμῶν,  
 ἐκπορευόμενοι  
 ἐκεῖθεν,  
 ἐκτινάξατε τὸν χοῦν  
 τὸν ὑποκάτω τῶν ποδῶν ὑμῶν.

The reason is most probably this, that at times Mark, who usually is more circumstantial in his narrative, did not consider it necessary, or was unable, to add any thing to the account. In such a case it was superfluous to transcribe into his book at length narratives which were sufficiently minute in that of his predecessor; and he therefore contented himself with a concise statement, supposing his readers to be acquainted with the more detailed account.

Perhaps the minuteness of some relations, which left no room for addition on the part of Matthew's reviser, was the reason why he entirely omitted certain occurrences (e. g. Matth. 8: 5—13. 19—21. 11: 1 seq.;) but more probably this is to be laid to the account of the voucher of his narratives, who did not allow to some occurrences the position which they occupy in Matthew, and did not in the sequel assign them the place which chronologically belonged to them. In fact subsequent investigations will show, that they really occurred in such chronological circumstances as would properly give them a different historical position.

## § 30.

We find but few entirely new events, unmentioned by Matthew, and consequently peculiar to Mark; perhaps there are three in all. One falls at the commencement of Jesus' ministry. (Mark 1: 23.) A demoniac in the synagogue at Capernaum, acknowledges the superior power dwelling in Jesus, and is healed. The others occurred shortly before the passion. A blind man is brought to Jesus at Bethsaida, and is restored to sight by his spittle and the laying on of his hands. (Mark 8: 22—27) The last is the account of the poor woman who cast two *lepta* into the treasury. (Mark 12: 41—44.)

This fact, likewise, assures us that it was not his purpose to give an independent historical book, for the preparation of which he himself

could not have been deficient in materials, and his voucher still less in abundant knowledge; but that his plan was confined to a revision of the existing work of Matthew.

### § 31.

The result of our investigations as to the mutual relation of the two Evangelists may be briefly presented as follows: Matthew is an original writer, as he was qualified to be, from having been an eye-witness of the occurrences narrated, a friend of the Teacher of whom he writes, and one to whom his future plans were intrusted. This work first saw the light. On account of the object he had in view, he was not anxious about the chronological arrangement of events, and, although he did not always neglect it, he yet often designedly presented together, in one view, certain discourses and actions which he found most suited to his particular purpose. Hence arose frequently a different order from the historical one. To detail the particular circumstances of each event would not have been subsidiary to his purpose, would have been superfluous, and often inconvenient. The incidental considerations presented by an extended narrative, would have diverted the reader from his main object, and distracted the attention which he wished to be directed to a single point, viz. the perception of the fact, that the predictions of the ancients concerning the Messiah were fulfilled in the life of Jesus. Matthew is an historical deduction; Mark is history.

The contents of the latter are not, in general, new. We very seldom find in him narratives untouched by his predecessor. He composed his history from the materials furnished him by the latter, which are the basis of his production; and he aimed only at the merit of greater minuteness and accuracy. It was now specially incumbent on him to follow historical order, from which his predecessor had often deviated on account of his didactic aim. Then, too, exact historical representation was his duty; he could not be so careless and indifferent as to the detail of particular circumstances and incidental matters which would impart perspicuity or vividness to the occurrences narrated. These obligations he fulfilled by means of the information he received from one of the earliest and most beloved disciples of Jesus. On the other hand, when the narrative of his predecessor made further detail unnecessary or impracticable, he became concise, and the reader was from the nature of the case referred to the previous history. Some events he wholly passed over; probably because his authority left him in uncertainty as to their true historical position. Mark's production may be regarded both as a history and a critical treatise.

### § 32.

Further; as it is necessary that such minute circumstances and such a number of accessory observations, even when ascertained and accurately taken from the mouth of eye-witnesses, should have been immediately noted down, and preserved in writing in order to prevent their being lost or confounded in the mind; and as, moreover, the circumstances of Mark's life, the attestation of history and internal evidence in

the production itself designate Peter as the source of the peculiar information and the particularity of narrative which we find in this Gospel, there can be no doubt of the correctness of the assertion made by the ancients that Mark noted down in writing the public discourses of Peter, and has communicated their contents to us; and I conceive the origin of Mark's Gospel to have been as follows:

The Gospel of Matthew having been published, while the apostles were teaching at Rome, (§ 16) this first biographical account of their exalted Master was carried thither to them, through the agency of Matthew himself perhaps, or that of others. From the novelty of the thing and its importance in respect to the condition and prospects of Christianity in Palestine, this would happen very speedily through the many messengers who came to them from zealous churches, or the Jews who left their country on account of the war,<sup>1</sup> and through the active communication which, on the same account, was kept up between Rome and Judea. For the common benefit of believers it was read in their assemblies, and Peter, who was peculiarly qualified for the purpose, explained and commented on it. Mark availed himself of these explanations and secured them by written notes, in which he was assisted by his close intimacy with the apostle. The expositions of the work of an eye-witness given by one who was himself an eye-witness of the acts of Jesus, and a coadjutor or companion in them, were of extraordinary value for the confirmation and instruction of believers, and they requested Mark to make his notes of general advantage and present them in a separate work. Hence his Gospel was called *κῆρυξις Πέτρου*, the preaching of Peter, and he himself Peter's interpreter.

These relations between the voucher and the historian explain the reason why he has been still more concise than Matthew in relating certain occurrences in which Peter bore a part, when we might expect him to be more copious; e. g. Matth. 14: 28—22. 16: 15—20. For any parts of the narrative which respected Peter personally, and of which he was the principal subject, would naturally be concisely treated and rapidly passed over by him in his discourses. His modesty led him to comment very little on himself and his actions, and at the mention of his frailties he could not suppress the embarrassment and shame of a virtuous mind.<sup>2</sup>

In conclusion, we will endeavor to ascertain definitely the precise time at which these occurrences probably took place. When Nero went to amuse himself in Achaia with his disgraceful pursuits, Vespasian accompanied him thither. Meanwhile the rebellion broke out in oppressed Palestine, and Vespasian obtained commission to chastise that country.<sup>3</sup> It was still winter when Nero sailed to Rome, Titus to Al-

<sup>1</sup> These emigrations had already commenced, under Albinus, before the rebellion broke out. Joseph. Bell. Jud. L. II. Ed. Haverc. c. 14. n. 2. and Ed. Basil. c. 24. p. 738. and Antiq. L. XX. c. ult.

<sup>2</sup> What Eusebius says (Demonstr. Evang. L. III. p. 78, 79. Ed. Rob. Steph.) in comparing Matth. 16: 15—20, with Mark 8: 29, 30, deserves to be noticed. *Τοσούτων εισημένων τῷ Πέτρῳ ὑπὸ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ, ὁ Μάρκος μὴδὲν τούτων μνημονεύσας, ὅτι μὴδ' ὁ Πέτρος ταῦθ', ὡς εἰκὸς, ἐν ταῖς αὐτοῦ διδασκαλίαις ἐξηγόρευεν . . . διὸ καὶ Μάρκος αὐτὰ παρέλιπεν.*

<sup>3</sup> Sueton. in Vespas. c. 4. Bell. Jud. L. III. c. 1.

exandria, and Vespasian hastened over the Hellespont to Syria.<sup>1</sup> When the weather had moderated so that the campaign could be opened, Vespasian led his legions into Galilee, took several places, and invested Jotapata on the 21st of Artemisius, our May.<sup>2</sup> In the month Panemus (July,) in the *thirteenth year of Nero*, this place was taken;<sup>3</sup> this event was followed in Gorpiaëus (September) by the taking of Tarichæa; in Hyperberetæus (October,) of Gamala; and after Gischala had surrendered no fortified place remained; all Galilee was laid waste and subjugated.<sup>4</sup>

The rebellion only raged the more furiously on this account in Judea and its metropolis; the scenes connected with the Idumæans followed; the massacre in the temple and the murder of Zacharias.<sup>5</sup> While these events were taking place, Matthew finished his Gospel; i. e. in the winter which began the 14th year of Nero, or, as the year of Nero's reign began about three months before the year of the Christian era, (see close of § 84 in this Part,) about the end of the 68th year after the birth of our Lord.

During the winter the Romans were at rest; but at the opening of spring Vespasian marched through Antipatris, Lydda and Jamnia, as far as Emmaus, and then to Jericho, where he formed a junction with the army which had proceeded on the eastern side of the Jordan under the command of Trajan. The inhabitants of Jericho fled to the mountains.<sup>6</sup> At the commencement of the campaign in the spring the sea was broken up, and the usual routes of communication with Rome were re-opened. The Gospel of Matthew, the first historical work which appeared relative to the fate, acts, and doctrines of the founder of the Christian sect, reached the capital of the world as a curiosity, and was read and expounded in the Christian assemblies. Sometime afterwards Nero died, in the month of June. For he ascended the throne in October, and occupied it thirteen years and eight months.<sup>7</sup> That he died in summer, we learn from Plutarch: "It was summer" says he, "when a courier with incredible despatch carried from Rome to Galba in Spain in seven days the intelligence of Nero's death."<sup>8</sup> The new emperor put himself in motion with a part of his army; his march, however, was slow and bloody.<sup>9</sup> During this time the city was in the hands of Nymphidius Sabinus and Tigellinus, till the latter was forced to lay down his arms. It was under these, ἐπὶ τῶν ἡγουμένων, if we

<sup>1</sup> Dio Cass. L. LXIII. p. 723. Wechel. Jos. Bell. Jud. L. III. c. 4. n. 2.

<sup>2</sup> Jos. Bell. Jud. L. III. c. 7. n. 3.

<sup>3</sup> Jos. Bell. Jud. L. III. c. 7. n. 36.

<sup>4</sup> Jos. Bell. Jud. L. III. c. 10. n. 10. L. IV. c. 1. n. 10. c. 2.

<sup>5</sup> Jos. Bell. Jud. L. IV. c. 5 and 6.

<sup>6</sup> Jos. Bell. Jud. L. IV. c. 8. n. 1, 2.

<sup>7</sup> Aurel. Vict. Epit. c. 5, says "annis tredecim." Eutrop. L. VII. c. 15. "imperiū decimo quarto obiit." Tacit. Hist. I. c. 5. "annos quatuordecim." Sueton. Ner. c. 40. "Paulo minus quatuordecim annis." Dio L. LXIII. p. 727.—*ἔτη δεκατρία καὶ μῆνας ὀκτώ.* Jos. B. J. L. IV. c. 9. n. 2. *τρῆς καὶ δέκα βασιλεύσας ἔτη καὶ ἡμέρας ὀκτώ.* He has confounded *μῆνας ὀκτώ* with *ἡμέρας ὀκτώ*.

<sup>8</sup> Plutarch in Galba, c. 7. *Ἦν δὲ θῆρος ἤδη, καὶ βραχὺ πρὸ δαίλης ἦκεν ἀπὸ Ρώμης Σικελὸς ἀνὴρ ἀπελευθερὸς ἑβδομαῖος. κ. τ. λ.*

<sup>9</sup> Tacit. Hist. L. I. c. 6.



understand aright the language of Clemens Romanus as to this event, that Peter and Paul were executed, i. e. between the last days of Nero and Galba's arrival. See in the sequel (§ 84,) what is said on the chronology of the Acts, immediately before the table. After their death, as we have before shewn (§ 16,) Mark published his Gospel. The words, *after their death*, are not definite enough to enable us to fix on any particular year. I therefore discard the date which I assigned in the former editions.

## L U K E .

## § 33.

Luke does not commence his Gospel in the genuine Jewish manner, with the narrative itself, but opens it according to the taste of the Greeks and Romans, with a *Proœmium*, in which he informs us of his intentions and motives, and of the writings already in existence relative to his subject.

The correct interpretation of this introduction would destroy or corroborate many hypotheses; but unfortunately, it is of such a nature that, though no doubt he to whom it was addressed understood it, we, on the contrary, to whom the circumstances of that period have become obscure, find great difficulty in extracting its meaning. It has not escaped learned men what light it would cast on the history of the origin of our first three Gospels; and hence they have laid peculiar stress on one clause or another which appeared to them to elucidate the origin of these books.<sup>1</sup>

This introduction is contained in a sentence comprising four members. The second clause of the sentence is to be kept distinct from the third. "*Ἐδοξε καὶ μοι*" is what the Greek grammarians call an *apodosis*, which from its nature commences another series of clauses, and occurs only after a *protasis* has been concluded. The parts of the latter, therefore, are disjoined from the former, and each has its appointed limits. Luke begins with *Ἐδοξε καὶ μοι* to speak of himself, and what precedes is separated from what he says of himself in such a way as to show that it has no reference to him. If *καθὼς παρέδοσαν* were to be referred down to *Ἐδοξε καὶ μοι*, and did actually relate to himself, it must have been, according to true grammatical construction, disposed under the latter clause, and the order of the clauses must have been as follows: "*Ἐδοξε καὶ μοι παρηκολούθησάν με ἀνωθεν πάντων ἀκριβοῶς, καθὼς παρέδοσαν ἡμῖν οἱ ἀπ' ἀρχῆς αὐτόπται . . . καθ' ἑξῆς σοι γράψαι*." Now this is not the case; hence *καθὼς παρέδοσαν* is connected with what precedes, and is, like that, of a general nature; while

<sup>1</sup> On this *Prologue*, as the introduction is likewise called, and the peculiar interpretation which is given of it, is based the following essay: "Einige Ideen ueber den wahrscheinlichen Ursprung unserer drey ersten Evangelien," by Dr. Ziegler, in Gabler's "Neuem theol. Journal." 1800. 5th St. The following one, likewise, in part: "Ueber die Entstehung der drey ersten Evangelien," by Dr. Vogel, in Gabler's "Journal für auserles. theol. Litt." 1804. 1 Bd. 1 St.

what follows *ἔδοξε καὶ μοί* refers particularly to Luke. The sentence contains, therefore, two parts, one general and the other particular.

The first clause of the first part has a determinate meaning, and asserts that many had composed histories of our Lord. The next clause expresses a comparison with the first : *such as those who were eye-witnesses have delivered to us*, one would suppose. But the words *καθὼς παρέδωκαν* are susceptible of another signification.

*Παραδίδόναι* signifies literally, *to give any thing into one's hands, to deliver, to communicate*; in a figurative sense, *to communicate something orally*, as knowledge, instruction, etc. Whichever be the meaning here, we must suppose the ellipsis of *διήγησιν* or tacitly bring it down from the first clause. With the first sense of the word the passage would run thus : *Forasmuch as many have undertaken to compose a history of the events which are notorious among us ; such as they who from the beginning were eye-witnesses and ministers of the word have delivered into our hands ; I also thought myself authorised*, etc. With the latter signification of the word it must be translated as follows : *Forasmuch as many have undertaken to compose a history of the events which are notorious among us, according as they who from the beginning were eye-witnesses . . . have orally communicated them to us ; I also thought myself authorised*, etc.

Now which of these interpretations is the correct one? If we discard for a moment the doubtful words, the purport of the introduction will be simply this : As many had written, he considered himself also as capable of writing, and intended, as he afterwards says, to bring the truth to light, *τὴν ἀσφάλειαν*. Restoring the clause which we discarded for a moment, and taking its sense to be : *As eye-witnesses and authorised teachers have orally represented them*, the chain of thought would be this : Inasmuch as many have written just as *the apostles have orally represented the history*, I considered myself as qualified for the task, and intend to ascertain the truth. Who would not be scandalised that Luke should promise something more certain than the apostles had communicated, whose representations had been reduced to writing by the many of whom he speaks? If now we must exonerate our author of so arrogant and inconsiderate an expression, the other sense must be the true one : *Inasmuch as many have undertaken to compose historical books, such as the apostles have put into our hands*, I considered myself, too, as capable, etc. Thus the import of the whole sentence is essentially altered, and it contains, if not an exculpation, at least a justification, afforded him by the example of the many who attempted, even after the apostles had published histories of our Lord, to compose similar works ; whence it was proper for him, particularly as his preparations had put him in a condition to do so, to write something more to be depended on than their accounts.

The other interpretation : Inasmuch as many have attempted to compose histories *as eye-witnesses have orally represented the occurrences*, is open also to the objection of proceeding on the supposition, that before the appearance of any historical work on the life and actions of our Lord, his history was detailed by the apostles in religious assemblies in so particular and methodical a manner, that narratives could be formed from written notes of their discourses. But this was not the custom of

the apostles. So far as their preaching was historical, it related only to the principal points in the history, to the sufferings and death of our Lord, and to the pillar of the whole Christian system, the resurrection. (Acts 5: 30, 31. 13: 28—39. 17: 3. 10: 38—42. 1 Cor. 16: 1—9. 20—29.) A detailed recital of these events was necessarily occasioned by the references made to prophetic declarations for the purpose of showing that such a fate was predicted of the Messiah. (See the passages above mentioned; likewise Acts 17: 3 and 11, κατ' ἡμέραν ἀνακρίνομεν τὰς γραφάς, εἰ ἔχου ταῦτα οὕτως. 8: 35. 18: 28. 26: 22, 23. 28: 23, 24.) With these events were connected the doctrines of the dominion of the world, which as Messiah he assumed after he was glorified, and of a final judgment and retribution in another state of existence, as may be perceived from many of the passages above referred to. In foreign countries they were obliged, to say the least, to reside very long in one place, as Paul did at Corinth, Ephesus, and Rome, in order to have time sufficient for detailed narratives.

At home, however, in the native land of Christianity, the previous knowledge of the people released them entirely from the necessity of such particularity. The actions of Jesus were so notorious in Palestine, that in preaching and instructing it was merely necessary to refer to the common knowledge of his history possessed by the generation then alive; as Peter did, according to the account in Acts 2: 22, and subsequently, even on occasion of the conversion of heathen at Cæsarea, (Acts 10: 37 seq.) and as Paul did at a still later period before king Agrippa. (Acts 26: 26 seq.) Now, as the history might be assumed in Palestine as generally known, the mode of teaching which naturally arose was to state the principal points in it as unquestionable, and then to found doctrines upon them.

The course, then, pursued by the apostles in foreign countries, unless they abode a long time in one place, contradicts the supposition of such a κήρυγμα, or such detailed and connected narratives, that histories of Jesus' ministry could be composed from them; and in particular such circumstantial narration is refuted by the procedure of the apostles in Palestine, where they referred directly to the knowledge which already existed among the people themselves.

Thus the words καθὼς παρέδωκαν, for this reason likewise, can mean only as follows: a narrative like those which eye-witnesses and authorised teachers have delivered into our hands; such for instance, as Matthew's, and the one given by Peter through Mark.

So much concerning the first part of this sentence; the second part ἔδοξε καμοί, presents an antithesis. As many have ventured to compose histories after the examples of eye-witnesses, *I also thought myself authorised.* The words παρακολουθεῖν ὅτι ἄνωθεν πᾶσιν ἀκριβῶς contain a further explanation and confirmation of the right he had to engage in his undertaking. I originally misunderstood these words, and first corrected my mistake on occasion of preparing my lectures upon Demosthenes' oration *Pro coronâ*.

The word παρακολουθεῖν includes the idea of presence. Used concerning events, it signifies to be present while they are passing, and, in its strictest sense, to be an eye-witness of what takes place. It also signifies to be mentally present, to accompany an address, discourse, or



written composition with attention, and occurs frequently in this sense in the works of the ancients.<sup>1</sup>

As it respects *πᾶσι*, we have our choice either to make it refer to the persons previously mentioned or, to *πράγματα*, the things which were notorious. For these two nouns are both in the plural number, and *πᾶσι* may refer to either.

If it be considered as referring to the men, e. g. to the *αὐτόπται* and *ὑπηρέται τοῦ λόγου*, the clause will signify: Having read the eye-witnesses with care, I will now, that you may no longer be in error, inform you of the truth. Who could avoid being perplexed that the historian should modestly apologise for venturing to publish a memoir of our Lord, after teachers commissioned by Christ himself, and on the other hand should presume to declare that he intended to do what had not yet been done, viz. to ascertain the truth, i. e. to give a more accurate account than they? If the word *πᾶσι* be made to refer to both the many, *πολλούς*, and the eye-witnesses together, (as indeed the expression *πᾶσι* includes the whole, and must relate to both,) no injustice is done to the many, it is true, by Luke's thinking himself better informed than they; this would be consonant with his more elevated point of view and the objects at which he aimed: but there would still subsist the same disrespect towards the eye-witnesses and authorised teachers; and what is yet more unbecoming, he would class them in the same category with *the many*. If he intended to say: *I have read them with care*, he would have expressed himself accurately and definitely, if instead of, 'I have read the *men* with care,' he had put *writings*, as he might have done by changing two syllables: *ἀνατάξασθαι διηγήσεως* and *παρακολουθηκότι—πᾶσι*.

The other noun in the plural number to which *πᾶσιν* may refer is *πράγματα*, the notorious occurrences. The expression *παρακολουθεῖν τοῖς πράγμασι* is common with the ancients, and signifies, *to follow events with attention as they occur*. There obtains, however, a nice distinction in its signification: in reference to a single event confined to one place, it signifies *to be present at it, to be an eye-witness of it*, as in the passage which we have cited below from Lucian's Laphthæan feast. But when used in speaking of events which are not confined to a single place, but occur in various places, and have whole countries for their theatre, it signifies that they are followed with attention from a certain point of view. Thus Demosthenes observed the events of his time with the eye of a statesman; Thucydides the occurrences of the Peloponnesian war as a soldier; and so did Josephus those of the Jewish war. In this sense the expression *παρακολουθεῖν τοῖς πράγμασι*, is used by them in the passages cited.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Theophrast. Character. Procem. Polyb. L. I. c. 12. L. III. c. 62., and many other passages referred to in Gataker ad Antonin. L. V. sec. 5. p. 188. Raphelius Annotat. in N. T. ex Polyb. &c. Kypke, Wetsten. ad h. loc.

<sup>2</sup> Demosth. De coronâ. c. 33. p. 382. ed. Harles. 1768. Reiske, T. I. p. 285. n. 20. *Ἐκεῖνος ὁ καιρὸς, καὶ ἡ ἡμέρα ἐκείνη, οὐ μόνον εὐνοῦν καὶ πλούσιον ἄνδρα ἐκάλε, ἀλλὰ καὶ παρακολουθεῖν ἡκότα τοῖς πράγμασιν ἐξαρχῆς, καὶ συλλογισόμενον ὁρθῶς.* De falsâ legat. p. 423. n. 20. *Ὅτα τούτου πομπηγεύματα ἀκριβέστατα εἰδὼς ἐγὼ, καὶ παρακολουθεῖν ἡκὼς ἄπασιν.* In Aristocrat.



The acts of Jesus were of this latter kind ; not confined to a single place, but scattered through Galilee and Judea. Now when Luke asserts that he was one *παρηκολοιθηκώς ἀνωθεν πᾶσιν ἀκριβῶς—τοῖς πράγμασι*—he does not express himself as having been an eye-witness of all the events, but as having been in the region of their occurrence, where he could observe them as they took place ; and this *ἀνωθεν*, from the beginning, from their first development. He means to say, therefore : I think myself authorised, who have attentively followed all these events from their commencement, etc. In this way he establishes in an eminent manner his claim to preference above the many.

He then promises *καθεξῆς γράψαι*, just as Thucydides expresses himself in his introduction, *ἔξῃς ὡς ἕκαστα ἐρίγνετο*, according to the

p. 683, n. 5. *Τί δήποτε, ταῦτ' εἰδὼς οὕτως ἀκριβῶς ἐγὼ, καὶ παρηκολοῦ-  
θηκὼς ἐκίοις τῶν ἀδικημάτων.* T. II. in Olympiodor. p. 1178. n. 10. *Τοῖς  
εἰδόσιν ἀκριβῶς ἅπαντα ταῦτα τὰ πράγματα ὡς ἔχει, καὶ παρηκολοῦθη-  
κόσιν ἐξαρχῆς.* Demost. Epist. I. p. 1463, end. *Ἄλλ' ὅσα τυγχάνω δι  
ἐμπειρίαν, καὶ τὸ παρηκολοῦθηκέναί τοις πράγμασιν εἰδὼς,  
ταῦτ' ἐβουλήθην τοῖς μὲν προαιρουμένοις λέγειν ἐμφανῇ ποιήσας.*

The Scholiast in Thucyd. V. 26: *Καθ' ἡσυχίαν τὶ αὐτῶν μᾶλλον  
αἰσθέσθαι*, explains the words thus : *Διὰ τὸ ἡσυχάζειν καὶ μὴ πολεμεῖν  
αὐτόν, μᾶλλον παρακολουθῆσαι τοῖς γενομένοις.* Joseph. contra Apion. L. I.  
c. 10. *Δεὸν ἐκεῖνο γινώσκειν, ὅτι δὲ τὸν ἄλλοις παράδοσιν πράξεων ἀληθινῶν  
ὑπισχνούμενον, αὐτὰς ἐπίστασθαι ταῦτας πρότερον ἀκριβῶς, ἢ παρηκο-  
λοῦθηκό τ' αὐτοῖς γεγονόσιν, ἢ παρατῶν εἰδῶτων πυνθανόμενον.* Observe  
the antithesis of the last words. The same antithesis recurs in Vit. Jose-  
phi. c. 65. p. 33, in his apostrophe to Justus of Tiberias: *Μήτε τὰ πραχ-  
θέντα κατὰ τὴν Γαλιλαίαν ἐπιστάμενος, ἥς γὰρ ἐν Βηρύτῳ τότε παρὰ βασιλεῖ,  
μήθ' ὅσα ἔπαθον Ῥωμαῖοι ἐπὶ τῆς Ἰωταπάτων πολιορκίας, ἣ ἔδρασαν ἡμᾶς,  
παρηκολοῦθησας, μήθ' ὅσα κατ' ἐμαντὸν ἔπραξα πολιορκούμενος δινη-  
θεὶς πυθέσθαι.* Πάντες γὰρ οἱ ἀπαγγέλλοντες ἂν διεφθάρησαν ἐπὶ τῆς παρα-  
τάξεως ἐκείνης. In Polyb. L. I. c. 67, the soldiers complain of the Cartha-  
ginians that they had not sent them generals who were acquainted with  
their deeds in Sicily, but one who had never been present to observe  
them: *Καρχηδονίους ἐπίτηδες τοὺς μὲν εἰδότας στρατηγούς τὰς γεγενημένας  
χρείας κατὰ Σικελίαν ἐξ αὐτῶν . . . οὐκ ἐξαποστέλλειν ὡς αὐτοὺς· τὸν δὲ μηδενὶ  
τούτων παρηκολοῦθηκό τ' αὐτοῖς, τοῦτον ἐκπεπομφέναι.* Remark the antithe-  
sis in Lucian (Conviv. seu Lapith. T. IX. Bipont. p. 46,) ὥστε θαυμάζω εἶ-  
τι σαφές εἶπεν ἐδύνατο, μὴ παρακολουθήσας ἐκείνοις, ἀφ' ὧν ἀρξαμένη ἐς τὸ  
αἶμα ἐτελεύτησεν αὐτοῖς ἡ φιλονεικία. Comp. Raphaelius, Wetstein. In the  
N. T. this expression occurs in 1 Tim. 4: 6. *καὶ τῆς καλῆς διδασκαλίας, ἣ  
παρηκολούθηκας: in the instruction of which thou hast been a present wit-  
ness.* We find it in the more limited sense in 2 Tim. 3: 10. *Σὺ δὲ  
παρηκολούθηκάς μου τῇ διδασκαλίᾳ, τῇ ἀγωγῇ, thou hast been an observing  
witness of my doctrines.* In the following verse, however, *τοῖς διωγμοῖς ἐν  
Ἀντιοχείᾳ, ἐν Ἰκονίῳ*, it takes the more extended signification: *thou wast  
near the scene of the persecutions which I underwent at Antioch, Iconium and  
Lystra.* At that time, indeed, Timothy had not yet become connected  
with Paul, and was but a boy ; but he lived in this region (Acts 16: 1, 2),  
and might have been a spectator of some of the occurrences, and have  
heard on the spot of others.

actual succession of events, to describe them in the order in which they took place.

He moreover assures Theophilus, for whom, primarily, he wrote his work, that he shall have τὴν ἀσφάλειαν, certain information, a true account.

This ἀσφάλεια he was to have, the historian says, speaking to Theophilus, περὶ ὧν κατηχήθης λόγων. These words either refer to the christian instruction generally which had been received by Theophilus, which Luke intended to exalt to absolute certainty, or to the accounts of the many, the contents of which had been learned by Theophilus from oral information. I do not believe that Luke intended to hint to his friend the doubtful nature of the information of his colleagues, or to depreciate his teachers in his estimation. The λόγοι περὶ ὧν κατηχήθης can then refer only to the communications orally made to him out of the histories of the many; and it was Luke's intention to correct these, and present to his friend such parts of them as were accurate and well authenticated. This is even required by the phraseology; for in Herodotus, Xenophon, and others, λόγοι are historical books, as Luke likewise calls his first history, viz. his Gospel, πρῶτον λόγον. (Acts 1: 1.) When the word is in the plural number it has this signification; when, on the contrary, it signifies the doctrines of christianity, it always appears in the singular: ὑπηρεῖται τοῦ λόγου, διακονία τοῦ λόγου, τὸν λόγον λαλεῖν, τὸν λόγον ἀκουεῖν, τὸν λόγον δέχεσθαι, &c.

If now we examine our Proœmium again, we shall find its sense to be as follows: "Many have composed accounts of the acts of our Lord, like those which eye-witnesses and ministers of the word have published: it will, therefore, be permitted me, likewise, to narrate these events in their order for thy advantage, that thou mayest ascertain what is true of the various relations which have been given thee; especially as I have carefully and attentively followed these events in the region where they occurred from the time when they began to develop themselves." These words comprise a description of the literature of Christianity in the time of Luke.

I. According to this representation there had appeared works on the history of Jesus by the hand of eye-witnesses and ministers of the faith, which had met with such a reception among Christians that others had been incited and induced to signalize themselves by similar works, and of these there were not merely one or two, but *many*. Although they could not expect to be held in equal estimation with their predecessors, who possessed advantages over them both from their personal knowledge of facts and from their office, still they did not remain unnoticed or without repute. Much less can we suppose this to have been the fate of the works which were of apostolical origin, or that they were unknown to the succeeding writers. To say the least, Luke, as we see, was acquainted with the works of his predecessors, and in regard to him the contrary assertion is positively false.

II. The *many* who are referred to did not translate from any work already in existence, with the aid perhaps of versions of it which had been made before; they *composed* their histories, συνέταξαν διηγήσεις, not ἠρμένευσαν. This was their mode of procedure, and the usual mode, and we must suppose it to have been that of eye-witness-

es more especially, as they had less reason to rely on foreign aid. It is very plain that Luke proceeded in the same way. He asserts his independence, appeals in support of it to his having been in the vicinity of the events while they were taking place, and pledges himself to present them in the order of their occurrence and to give an authentic account of what had happened. Thus, if the hypotheses of the day are applicable to others, they certainly are not to him.

III. From the facts we have adduced in explanation of the introduction, this also is clear. As long as an appeal could be made to the common knowledge of the people, the necessity of a history was not felt by the teachers or by the people. But when the generation of contemporaries began gradually to pass away, and the number of those who retained in their memories the fame of our Lord's actions and were vouchers for them was continually diminishing, the want of documents began to be felt, and it became necessary to supply the place of the expiring voice of the people by written accounts. We hence see that the history of our Lord's actions could not have been written very early; not before a considerable time had elapsed after his death. Moreover, those engaged in the office of teaching must have been the first to perceive the necessity of assisting the declining knowledge of the people, from the impediments they met with in their employment; and hence it is not at all strange that the first histories should have come from Apostles.

Now, however, it happened as it invariably does; the way once opened, the *many* followed and collected together in books the stories of their fathers and the surviving reports of the time. Thus arose at once a historic era in the Christian school.

IV. Under these circumstances Luke appeared; and his special object was to set his friend's mind at rest respecting the many histories which followed the earliest works of the apostles, and to supply the place of their unauthenticated statements with a true exhibition of facts.

### § 34.

Luke, although in his phraseology we perceive more Greek elegance than in the other Gospels, is still in the tone and coloring of his language a Jew or Syrian. If we consider the acquaintance with Judaism which he exhibits in both his works, we must admit that his was no superficial and half-way knowledge of the opinions of the Jews, though it was almost impossible for a foreigner to comprehend them; and that he was perfectly familiar with the ceremonies of their temple-service and their other religious solemnities. The interpreter of his Gospel is never left in the dark, or tempted to wish that the writer had possessed a better acquaintance with Judaism, its ritual and ceremonials. No special proof of this can be required in the way of examples, as their number would be too great, and we should be obliged to attend to many minutiae, which, however, are the very things in which nicety of knowledge is evinced. Thus much may be inferred from his language and the knowledge he exhibits; viz. from the former, that he was an



inhabitant of Syria or Palestine; from the latter, that he was a Jew or a well-informed proselyte.

As to the first point, history affords us information of a more decisive character; according to which Luke was born at Antioch.<sup>1</sup> Moreover, in regard to his religious circumstances, we infer from the Epistle to the Colossians that he was an adherent to Judaism from his own choice, not from his descent or birth. At the close of this Epistle, Paul subjoins the salutations of friends who were then with him, and mentions first those of Jewish extraction. (4: 10—12.) After concluding the catalogue of those *ἐκ περιτομῆς*, he adds the rest, and among them Luke (11—15), who is therefore to be regarded as a proselyte.

His occupation was that of a physician,<sup>2</sup> (Coloss. 4: 14), and he could not want opportunity to prepare himself for it in so scientific a city as Antioch. Perhaps it was his desire to become more intimately acquainted with the religion he had chosen which led him to Palestine, the ancient seat of Judaism, as Paul was led thither by his zeal in the pursuit of learning. But whatever may have been the reason, he was residing in the country, according to his introduction, when Jesus entered on his ministry and went about teaching and healing. Luke, from his being a physician, had peculiar motives to pay attention to facts of this kind; and on this account, likewise, his statements possess a peculiar value, as those of a person of judgment and experience.

As to his relation to the Christian sect at its rise, a tradition has been preserved that he was one of the seventy disciples.<sup>3</sup> This account is confirmed by the fact that he alone of all the Evangelists has mentioned the seventy, and carefully given the history of their mission and return and the instructions connected with them (10: 1—25), as though he felt himself called upon to do so by particular personal concern in them. Moreover, he exhibits a minute acquaintance with these occurrences, such as could be expected only from an eye-witness.

He has nowhere mentioned the time when he left Palestine. When Paul first ventured to pass over into Europe, Luke resided at Alexandria-Troas, and went with him. (Acts 16: 8, 11.) Was it the case that he had previously become acquainted with Paul at Antioch, and was now induced by affection and veneration to offer himself as his companion in this enterprise? He accompanied the apostle over to Philippi, (Acts 16: 12), and when the latter was here thrown into prison, Luke remained at liberty, and seems even to have resided in this city for a long period. When Paul, some years after, returned to Asia by way of

<sup>1</sup> Euseb. H. E. L. III. c. 4. Hieronym. Script. Eccles. V. Lucas.

<sup>2</sup> Traces have been found, it is thought, in his writings of his medical profession. In his Gospel (4: 38) he speaks of a *πνευτῶ μεγάλῳ*, just as Galen (De diff. febr.) distinguishes *τὴν μέγαν τε καὶ μικρὰν πνευτὸν*. (Wetsten. ad loc.) In Acts 13: 11, he uses the technical word *ἀγλῆς* respecting blindness. (Galen. apud Wetsten. ad loc.)

<sup>3</sup> Origen. Dial. contra Marcion. Sect. I. p. 8. ed. Wetsten. and Tom. I. Opp. p. 806. ed. De la Rue.—Epiphani. Adv. Hæres. XXXI. or LI. § 12.

Theophylact (Proœm. in Comm. in Evang. Luc.) seems to have had good authority for saying: *Λουκᾶς ὁ θεῖος, Ἀντιοχεὺς μὲν ἦν, ἰατρός δὲ καὶ τὴν ἔξω σοφίαν πολὺς, οὐ μὴν ἀλλὰ καὶ τὴν Ἑβραϊκὴν παιδείαν ἐξησκήσατο, τοῖς Ἰηροσολύμοις ἐπιφοιτήσας, ὅτε ὁ κύριος ἡμῶν ἐδίδασκεν. Ὡστε φασὶ τινες ἓνα καὶ αὐτὸν γενέσθαι τῶν ἐβδομήκοντα ἀποστόλων.*



Macedonia from his second European journey, Luke was still there. He may perhaps have crossed from Asia to Philippi to meet Paul; at any rate he was in his company at the embarkation for Troas (Acts 20: 6), and went with him to Jerusalem, (Acts 21: 27), where Paul was apprehended.

This time, likewise, Luke did not share his imprisonment, but seems to have followed him of his own accord to Cæsarea, and, as the friends of the prisoner had access to him (Acts 24: 23), not to have forsaken him till his destination was determined. Then, when Paul was sent to Rome to receive sentence, Luke embarked with him (Acts 27: 1), and remained at his side (2 Tim. 4: 11. Coloss. 4: 14. Philem. 24), till his fate was decided.

He has been sometimes supposed to be the Lucius from whom Paul sends a salutation in his Epistle to the Romans (16: 2); but Luke was not at Corinth at the time when that Epistle was written. He resided, as we have said, at Philippi; or perhaps went over from Troas to meet the apostle when he was on his way through Macedonia. The truth on the latter point is of little importance in the case; suffice it to say, that his absence from Paul at that time does not permit us to confound him with this Lucius.

Some Mss. of the old Latin version call his book *Evangelium secundum Lucanum*;¹ from which it has been inferred that he was a freedman, whose name according to the Roman custom was changed to *Lucanus*. The supposition has seemed the more plausible as slaves often practised the art of medicine.² But besides that there is no trace of this change of name either in the fathers or in other versions, we know that the Latin copyists sometimes took the liberty to make *Offanus* of *Offa*, *Bedanus* of *Beda*, etc.³

### § 35.

He wrote his Gospel primarily for a certain Theophilus, to whom he gives the title *κατάτιστος*, which in the ancient inscriptions is conferred upon high priests and priestesses, those who had the superintendence of sacred edifices and games, deputies of the emperor in the provinces, overseers of the emperor's revenues, *ἐπιτρόποις τοῦ καίσαρος*,⁴ *ducenariis exactoribus*, such as were the *ἐπίτροποι* in the Palmyrene inscriptions.

Were we better informed in regard to this person to whom Luke has dedicated his writings, considerable light might be thrown on the history of this Gospel; unfortunately, however, the investigations concerning this point have been nearly unavailing, are too general in their results, and promise little for the future.

Judging from the observations made by Luke to render himself intelligible and perspicuous to his reader, the latter certainly cannot have

1 Cod. Vercell. S. Eusebii. Vindobon. Cottonian.

2 Sueton. in Caio, c. 8. Seneca, De benef. III. 24. Quinctilian, VII. 2. n. 26.

3 Mabillon, Vet. Analect. T. IV. p. 521.

4 Wheeler's Journey into Greece. Vol. III. p. 233. *ANT. ΚΑ. ΑΛΦΗΝΟΝ ΚΡΑΤΙΣΤΟΝ ΕΠΙΤΡΟΠΟΝ ΤΟΥ ΣΕΒΑΣΤΟΥ*, κ. τ. λ.

been an inhabitant of Palestine. Speaking of Capernaum, he is obliged to add that it is a city in Galilee, (4: 31.) So in speaking of Nazareth (1: 26); and Arimathea, (23: 51.) He is obliged to specify minutely the situation of the country of the Gadarenes. (8: 26.) He tells the situation of Mount Olivet, and its distance from Jerusalem, (Acts 1: 12), and specifies in stadia the distance of Emmaus from the capital. (Gosp. Luke 24: 13.)

He was certainly, too, not an inhabitant of Crete, (Acts 27: 8 and 12;) nor of Athens or its vicinity, for in that case he would not have been obliged to make the observation he does concerning the characteristic trait of this people, which had been pointed out before by Demosthenes (*Orat. I. in Phil.*): ἡ βούλεσθε περιϊόντες πυνθάνεσθαι κατὰ τὴν ἀγοράν, λέγεται τι καινόν. (Acts 17: 21.) Nor can we suppose him to have been a Macedonian. (Acts 16: 12.)

An inhabitant of Antioch, too, could hardly have been so ignorant of the geography of Palestine, which was so near. It is an assertion of modern date, made by the lexicographer Bar Bahlul, that he was an Alexandrian; but this is invalidated by the circumstance that the old Alexandrian fathers did not ascribe this honor to their church. Origen seems to have known no more than that Luke wrote for Gentiles. (*Euseb. H. Eccl. L. VI. c. 25.*)

The testimony of the Alexandrian patriarch Eutychius in favor of some distinguished man in Rome or Italy<sup>1</sup> is too remote from those times to be decisive; yet it has some plausibility. We see that Luke is careful to give Theophilus explanations respecting places with which he supposed him to be unacquainted. This he does in narrating Paul's voyage to Rome; and for that purpose is very particular in his descriptions. (Acts 27: 8, 12 and 16.) But when he comes to Sicily and Italy, (Acts 28: 12, 13 and 15), he mentions all the cities as though they were well known to Theophilus; Syracuse, Rhegium, Puteoli, (on which last name Josephus was obliged to comment for the sake of his Greek and oriental readers,<sup>2</sup>) as well as still smaller places, *Tres Tabernæ, Via Appia*, etc.

### § 36.

That Luke was acquainted with Matthew's work is clear from many parts of his book; it is most evident, however, from the passages taken

وفي عصر هذا الملك أيضا كتب لوقا انجيله  
باليونانية الي رجل شريف من علما الروم يقول له ثاوفيل.

Eutych. Orig. Eccles. Alex. Edit. Seldeni. Lond. 1642. p. 36. The author plainly distinguishes between *اليونانية* and *الروم*

has the confined signification of Rome or its precincts, contrary to common Arabic usage. The whole work appeared subsequently: Eutychii Patr. Alexandrini Annales. Jo. Seldeno et Edw. Pocockio, Oxon. 1658, in which the passage may be found in T. I. p. 334.

<sup>2</sup> Josephi Vita, p. 626. Ed. Basil. Δικαιοχρίαν, ἣν Ἰτάλοι Ποτιώλους καλοῦσι,

away from their connection by Mark, but omitted by him in their proper place ; all of which Luke has restored from Matthew, and literally transcribed into his own work.

## Matth. 8: 19.

Ἀκολουθήσω σοι ὅπου  
ἐάν ἀπέρχῃ.  
Καὶ λέγει αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς·  
Αἱ ἀλώπεκες φωλεοὺς ἔχουσι,  
καὶ τὰ πετεινὰ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ  
κατασκηνώσκει·  
ὁ δὲ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου  
οὐκ ἔχει  
ποῦ τὴν κεφαλὴν κλίνει.

## Matth. 8: 9.

Καὶ γὰρ ἐγὼ ἀνθρώπος εἰμι  
ὑπὸ ἐξουσίαν,  
ἔχων ὑπ' ἑμαυτὸν στρατιώτας·  
καὶ λέγω τούτῳ, πορεύθητι,  
καὶ πορεύεται·  
καὶ ἄλλῳ, ἔρχου,  
καὶ ἔρχεται·  
καὶ τῷ δούλῳ μου, ποιήσον  
τούτο,  
καὶ ποιῇ.  
Ἀκούσας δὲ ὁ Ἰησοῦς,  
ἐθαύμασε,  
καὶ εἶπε τοῖς ἀκολουθοῦσιν·  
Ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν,  
οὐδὲ ἐν τῷ Ἰσραὴλ  
τοσαύτην πίστιν εὑρόν.

## Matth. 12: 43.

Ὅταν δὲ τὸ ἀκάθαρτον πνεῦμα  
ἐξέλθῃ ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου,  
διέρχεται δι' ἀνύδρων τόπων,  
ζητοῦν ἀνάπαυσιν,  
καὶ οὐκ εὐρίσκει.  
Τότε λέγει· Ἐπιστρέψω  
εἰς τὸν οἶκόν μου,  
ὅθεν ἐξῆλθον.  
Καὶ ἐλθὼν εὐρίσκει  
σχολάζοντα,

## Luke 9: 57.

Ἀκολουθήσω σοι ὅπου  
ἂν ἀπέρχῃ, κύριε.  
Καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς·  
Αἱ ἀλώπεκες φωλεοὺς ἔχουσι,  
καὶ τὰ πετεινὰ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ  
κατασκηνώσκει·  
ὁ δὲ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου  
οὐκ ἔχει  
ποῦ τὴν κεφαλὴν κλίνει.

## Luke 7: 8.

Καὶ γὰρ ἐγὼ ἀνθρώπος εἰμι  
ὑπὸ ἐξουσίαν  
τασσόμενος,  
ἔχων ὑπ' ἑμαυτὸν στρατιώτας·  
καὶ λέγω τούτῳ· Πορεύθητι,  
καὶ πορεύεται·  
καὶ ἄλλῳ· Ἔρχου,  
καὶ ἔρχεται·  
καὶ τῷ δούλῳ μου· Ποιήσον  
τούτο,  
καὶ ποιῇ.  
Ἀκούσας δὲ ταῦτα ὁ Ἰησοῦς,  
ἐθαύμασεν αὐτόν·  
καὶ στραφεὶς τῷ ἀκολουθοῦντι  
αὐτῷ ὄχλῳ εἶπε·  
Λέγω ὑμῖν,  
οὐδὲ ἐν τῷ Ἰσραὴλ  
τοσαύτην πίστιν εὑρόν.

## Luke 11: 24.

Ὅταν τὸ ἀκάθαρτον πνεῦμα  
ἐξέλθῃ ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου,  
διέρχεται δι' ἀνύδρων τόπων,  
ζητοῦν ἀνάπαυσιν·  
καὶ μὴ εὐρίσκον,  
λέγει· Ἐπιστρέψω  
εἰς τὸν οἶκόν μου,  
ὅθεν ἐξῆλθον.  
Καὶ ἐλθὼν εὐρίσκει

## Matth. 12: 43.

σεσαρωμένον καὶ κεκοσμημένον.  
 Τότε πορεύεται καὶ παραλαμβάνει  
 μεθ' ἑαυτοῦ  
 ἐπὶ ἑτέρα πνεύματα  
 πονηρότερα ἑαυτοῦ,  
 καὶ εἰσελθόντα κατοικεῖ ἐκεῖ·  
 καὶ γίνεται τὰ ἔσχατα  
 τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐκείνου  
 χείρονα τῶν πρώτων.

## Luke 11: 24.

σεσαρωμένον καὶ κεκοσμημένον.  
 Τότε πορεύεται καὶ παραλαμβάνει  
 ἐπὶ ἑτέρα πνεύματα  
 πονηρότερα ἑαυτοῦ,  
 καὶ εἰσελθόντα κατοικεῖ ἐκεῖ·  
 καὶ γίνεται τὰ ἔσχατα  
 τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐκείνου  
 χείρονα τῶν πρώτων.

## § 37.

This coincidence with Matthew, however, is found only in narratives omitted by Mark; in other cases Luke adheres more closely to the latter than the former. As we have before cited the feeding of the four thousand, we will now take for an example the feeding of the five thousand.

## Matth. 14: 15.

Ἀπόλυσον τοὺς ὄχλους,  
 ἵνα ἀπελθόντες  
 εἰς τὰς  
 κώμας,  
 ἀγοράσωσιν ἑαυτοῖς  
 βρώματα.  
 Ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν  
 αὐτοῖς·  
 Οὐ χρεῖαν ἔχουσιν  
 ἀπέλθειν·  
 δότε αὐτοῖς ὑμεῖς  
 φαγεῖν . . .  
 λαβὼν τοὺς πέντε ἄρτους  
 καὶ τοὺς δύο ἰχθύας,  
 ἀναβλέψας εἰς τὸν  
 οὐρανόν,  
 εὐλόγησε·  
 καὶ κλάσας,  
 ἔδωκε  
 τοῖς μαθηταῖς  
 τοὺς ἄρτους·  
 οἱ δὲ μαθηταὶ τοῖς  
 ὄχλοις.

## Mark 6: 36.

Ἀπόλυσον αὐτοὺς,  
 ἵνα ἀπελθόντες  
 εἰς τοὺς  
 κύκλῳ  
 ἄγρους  
 καὶ κώμας,  
 ἀγοράσωσιν ἑαυτοῖς  
 ἄρτους·  
 τί γὰρ φάγωσιν οὐκ  
 ἔχουσιν.  
 Ὁ δὲ ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν  
 αὐτοῖς·  
 Δότε αὐτοῖς ὑμεῖς  
 φαγεῖν . . .  
 Καὶ λαβὼν τοὺς πέντε  
 ἄρτους  
 καὶ τοὺς δύο ἰχθύας,  
 ἀναβλέψας εἰς τὸν  
 οὐρανόν,  
 εὐλόγησε·  
 καὶ κατέκλασε  
 τοὺς ἄρτους,  
 καὶ ἐδίδου  
 τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ,  
 ἵνα παραθῶσιν  
 αὐτοῖς.

## Luke 9: 12.

Ἀπόλυσον τὸν ὄχλον,  
 ἵνα ἀπελθόντες  
 εἰς τὰς  
 κύκλῳ  
 κώμας  
 καὶ τοὺς ἄγρους,  
 καταλύσωσι, καὶ εὐρωσιν  
 ἐπισιτισμόν·  
 ὅτι ὧδε ἐν ἐρήμῳ τόπῳ  
 ἐσμέν.  
 Εἶπε δὲ πρὸς αὐτούς·  
 Δότε αὐτοῖς ὑμεῖς  
 φαγεῖν . . .  
 Λαβὼν δὲ τοὺς πέντε  
 ἄρτους  
 καὶ τοὺς δύο ἰχθύας,  
 ἀναβλέψας εἰς τὸν  
 οὐρανόν,  
 εὐλόγησεν αὐτούς·  
 καὶ κατέκλασε,  
 καὶ ἐδίδου  
 τοῖς μαθηταῖς,  
 παρατιθέναι τὰ  
 ὄχλῳ.



## Matth. 26: 18.

Ἐπάγετε εἰς τὴν πόλιν  
πρὸς τὸν δεῖνα,

καὶ εἵπατε αὐτῷ·

Ὁ διδάσκαλος λέγει·

Ὁ καιρὸς μου ἐγγύς ἐστι·  
πρὸς σε ποιῶ τὸ πάσχα,  
μετὰ τῶν μαθητῶν μου.

Καὶ ἐποίησαν οἱ μαθηταὶ  
ὡς συνέταξεν αὐτοῖς  
ὁ Ἰησοῦς,  
καὶ ἡτοίμασαν τὸ  
πάσχα.

## Mark 14: 13.

Ἀπαντήσῃ ὑμῖν  
ἄνθρωπος  
κεράμιον ὕδατος  
βαστάζων·  
ἀκολουθήσατε αὐτῷ·  
καὶ ὅπου ἂν εἰσέλθῃ,

εἵπατε τῷ οἰκοδεσπότῃ·

Ὅτι ὁ διδάσκαλος λέγει·  
Ποῦ ἐστι τὸ κατάλυμα,  
ὅπου τὸ πάσχα  
μετὰ τῶν μαθητῶν μου  
φάγω;

Καὶ αὐτὸς ὑμῖν δείξει  
ἀνώγειον μέγα  
ἐστρωμένον,  
ἐτοιμον· ἐκεῖ ἐτοιμάσατε  
ἑμῖν.

## Luke 22: 10.

Συναντήσῃ ὑμῖν  
ἄνθρωπος  
κεράμιον ὕδατος  
βαστάζων·

ἀκολουθήσατε αὐτῷ  
εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν, οὗ  
εἰσπορεύεται·

καὶ ἔρῃτε τῷ οἰκοδεσπότῃ,  
τῆς οἰκίας·

Λέγει σοι ὁ διδάσκαλος·

Ποῦ ἐστι τὸ κατάλυμα,  
ὅπου τὸ πάσχα  
μετὰ τῶν μαθητῶν μου  
φάγω;

Καὶ ἐκεῖνος ὑμῖν δείξει  
ἀνώγειον μέγα  
ἐστρωμένον·  
ἐκεῖ ἐτοιμάσατε.

## Luke 18: 18.

Ἐπρωτόησέ τις αὐτὸν . . .

Διδάσκαλε ἀγαθὲ, τί ποιήσας

ζωὴν αἰώνιον κληρονομήσω;

Εἶπε δὲ αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς·

Τί με λέγεις ἀγαθόν;  
οὐδεὶς ἀγαθός, εἰ μὴ εἷς, ὁ Θεός.

Τὰς ἐντολάς οἶδας·

“Μὴ μοιχεύσῃς· μὴ φονεύσῃς·  
μὴ κλέψῃς· μὴ ψευδομαρτυρήσῃς·

τίμα τὸν πατέρα σου καὶ τὴν  
μητέρα σου.”

Ὁ δὲ εἶπε·

Ταῦτα πάντα ἐφύλαξά μιν  
ἐκ νεότητός μου.

Ἀκούσας δὲ ταῦτα ὁ Ἰησοῦς,  
εἶπεν αὐτῷ·

Ἔτι ἓν σοι λείπει·

πάντα ὅσα ἔχεις πώλησον,

καὶ διάδος πτωχοῖς,

καὶ ἕξεις θησαυρὸν ἐν οὐρανῷ  
καὶ δεῦρο, ἀκολουθεῖ μοι . . .

ὁ Ἰησοῦς . . . εἶπε·

## Mark 10: 17.

Ἐπρωτόα αὐτόν·

Διδάσκαλε ἀγαθὲ, τί ποιήσω,  
ἵνα ζωὴν αἰώνιον κληρονομήσω;

Ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν αὐτῷ·

Τί με λέγεις ἀγαθόν;  
οὐδεὶς ἀγαθός, εἰ μὴ εἷς, ὁ Θεός.

Τὰς ἐντολάς οἶδας·

“Μὴ μοιχεύσῃς· μὴ φονεύσῃς·  
μὴ κλέψῃς· μὴ ψευδομαρτυρήσῃς·  
μὴ ἀποστερήσῃς·

τίμα τὸν πατέρα σου καὶ τὴν  
μητέρα.”

Ὁ δὲ ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν αὐτῷ·

Διδάσκαλε,

ταῦτα πάντα ἐφύλαξά μιν  
ἐκ νεότητός μου.

Ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς ἐμβλέψας αὐτῷ,  
ἠγάπησεν αὐτόν,  
καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῷ·

Ἐν σοι ὑστερεῖ·

ὑπάγε, ὅσα ἔχεις πώλησον,  
καὶ δός τοῖς πτωχοῖς·

καὶ ἕξεις θησαυρὸν ἐν οὐρανῷ·  
καὶ δεῦρο, ἀκολουθεῖ μοι . . .

ὁ Ἰησοῦς λέγει . . . . .

## Luke 18: 18.

Πῶς δυσκόλως  
οἱ τὰ χρήματα ἔχοντες  
εἰσελεύσονται εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν  
τοῦ Θεοῦ!  
Εὐκοπώτερον γάρ ἐστι,  
κάμηλον διὰ τρυμαλιᾶς  
ὑαφίδος  
εἰσελθεῖν, ἢ πλούσιον  
εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ Θεοῦ  
εἰσελθεῖν.

## Mark 10: 17.

Πῶς δυσκόλως  
οἱ τὰ χρήματα ἔχοντες  
εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ Θεοῦ  
εἰσελεύσονται! . . . .  
Εὐκοπώτερόν ἐστι,  
κάμηλον διὰ τῆς τρυμαλιᾶς τῆς  
ὑαφίδος  
εἰσελθεῖν, ἢ πλούσιον  
εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ Θεοῦ  
εἰσελθεῖν.

This last passage, as well as many others, is very well suited, as it appears in Matthew, Mark, and Luke, to shew the order in which the Evangelists succeeded each other. Mark adheres to Matthew (see Matth. 19: 16) much more closely than Luke does; thus, among other things, he retains ὑστερεῖν where Luke uses ἐν σοι λείπει,—δός where the latter uses διάδος,—ὑπάγε before ὅσα ἔχεις, while Luke omits it. But where Mark deviates from Matthew and pursues his own way, as, e. g. at the beginning and end of the passage, and in stating the commandments (which by a peculiar idiom appear in the future subjunctive), Luke coincides with Mark in the smallest particulars, and it is evident that he was one of those preceding writers mentioned by Luke in his Proœmium.

We will now present in addition some specimens of passages found only in Mark and Luke:

## Mark 1: 24, 25.

Ἐα! τί ἡμῖν καὶ σοι,  
Ἰησοῦ Ναζαρηνέ;  
Ἦλθες ἀπολέσαι ἡμᾶς·  
οἶδά σε τίς εἶ,  
ὁ ἅγιος τοῦ Θεοῦ!  
Καὶ ἐπετίμησεν αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς,  
λέγων· Φιμώθητι,  
καὶ ἔξελθε ἐξ αὐτοῦ.

## Luke 4: 34, 35.

Ἐα! τί ἡμῖν καὶ σοι,  
Ἰησοῦ Ναζαρηνέ;  
Ἦλθες ἀπολέσαι ἡμᾶς·  
οἶδά σε τίς εἶ,  
ὁ ἅγιος τοῦ Θεοῦ!  
Καὶ ἐπετίμησεν αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς,  
λέγων· Φιμώθητι,  
καὶ ἔξελθε ἐξ αὐτοῦ.

## Mark 10: 14, 15.

Ἀφετε τὰ παιδιά  
ἔρχεσθαι πρός με,  
καὶ μὴ κωλύετε αὐτά·  
τῶν γὰρ τοιούτων ἐστὶν  
ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ Θεοῦ.  
Ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν,  
ὅς ἐάν μὴ δέξηται  
τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ Θεοῦ  
ὡς παιδίον,  
οὐ μὴ εἰσέλθῃ εἰς αὐτήν.

## Luke 18: 16, 17:

Ἀφετε τὰ παιδιά  
ἔρχεσθαι πρός με,  
καὶ μὴ κωλύετε αὐτά·  
τῶν γὰρ τοιούτων ἐστὶν  
ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ Θεοῦ.  
Ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν,  
ὅς ἐάν μὴ δέξηται  
τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ Θεοῦ  
ὡς παιδίον,  
οὐ μὴ εἰσέλθῃ εἰς αὐτήν.

## Mark 12: 38, 39, 40.

Ἀπὸ τῶν γραμματέων,  
τῶν θελόντων  
ἐν στολαῖς περιπατεῖν,  
καὶ ἄσπασμούς  
ἐν ταῖς ἀγοραῖς,  
καὶ πρωτοκαθεδρίας ἐν ταῖς  
συναγωγαῖς,  
καὶ πρωτοκλισίας ἐν τοῖς δείπνοις·  
οἱ κατεσθίοντες  
τὰς οἰκίας τῶν χρηρῶν,  
καὶ προφάσει μακρὰ  
προσενύχοντο.  
Οὗτοι λήγονται  
περισσότερον κρίμα.

## Luke 20: 46, 47.

Ἀπὸ τῶν γραμματέων,  
τῶν θελόντων  
περιπατεῖν ἐν στολαῖς,  
καὶ φιλοῦντων ἄσπασμούς  
ἐν ταῖς ἀγοραῖς,  
καὶ πρωτοκαθεδρίας ἐν ταῖς  
συναγωγαῖς,  
καὶ πρωτοκλισίας ἐν τοῖς δείπνοις·  
οἱ κατεσθίουσι  
τὰς οἰκίας τῶν χρηρῶν,  
καὶ προφάσει μακρὰ  
προσενύχονται.  
Οὗτοι λήγονται  
περισσότερον κρίμα.

## § 38.

Some, however, are disposed to ascribe these appearances, from which we infer that one writer had read the work of the other and transferred passages from it into his own, to very different causes. A learned man, of whom we have before made honorable mention, supposes that many of these passages were subsequently interpolated from one Gospel into the other in order to supply deficiencies.<sup>1</sup>

How much probability there is in this supposition will, we hope, be shown by the following observations. (1.) No case is known in which two historians of the best days of either Greece or Rome agree in substance and at the same time very frequently in phraseology. Even where one historian relies on the authority of another for the purport of what he narrates, he invariably clothes the narration in his own language. For, educated in the schools of the grammarians, sophists, and declaimers, they prided themselves on expressing with elegance in another way what they borrowed from their predecessors.

Not so with the orientals. They borrowed literally what they found in the works of their predecessors. The author of the book of Chronicles either transcribed directly from the books of Samuel and of Kings the passages in which he coincides with them, seldom making use of different phraseology or inserting a clause of his own; or else both writers drew literally from certain annals or other sources. The account of Joshua's death and the character of the people of his time is transferred literally from the book of Joshua into that of Judges (Josh. 24: 29—32. Judges 2: 7—9). This account, it is true, is not very long; the passages which the book of Kings has in common with Isaiah are of greater importance (2 Kings 18: 17—37. Isaiah 36: 2—22. 2 Kings 19: 1—37. Isaiah 37: 1—the end); as also those which the same book has in com-

<sup>1</sup> Gratz, Neuer Versuch, die Entstehung der drey ersten Evangelien zu erklären. §. 36 seq.; and more recently, Hist. kritischer Kommentar ueber das Evangelium des Matthæus. Tubing. 1821.

mon with Jeremiah (2 Kings 25: 1—22. Jeremiah 52: 4—27). It is but seldom that the phraseology is altered or an additional clause inserted. Literal transcribing is practised by the Arabians in their geographical and historical works. Now, when we find a frequent occurrence of identical phraseology in different Gospels, the authors of which we know to have been orientals and Hebrews, to imagine that the coincidence arose from interpolations is to seek for another cause of what was only in accordance with the national custom in writing history. When, moreover, the Evangelists change the phraseology or insert a clause of their own, they do what the historians of their nation were in the habit of doing; with this difference, that they were able to enrich the narrative from their own knowledge, and that, as they wrote in Greek, one possessed and consequently manifests greater skill than another in the use of that language.

(2.) Now, as it is plain why they proceed in this manner, one often retaining the words of another and then again employing his own language, so, moreover, no proof is afforded by the appearance of the Gospels that it was ever attempted to complete one from the other. At the very outset each retains its peculiar deficiency in point of completeness. Matthew has not taken a word of his history of Jesus' youth from Luke, nor the latter from the former. No care of this kind can have been exercised towards Mark in respect to this history; for he is strikingly distinguished from his companions by his total silence on the subject. One contains one portion of the history, another a different one, and Mark nothing at all of it. Passing from the beginning to the end of the Gospels, we find a similar case as respects what occurred after the resurrection. Luke has gone more into detail and is more complete than the others; Mark is remarkable for the abrupt termination of his book, which ends as suddenly as though it had not been fully finished, and yet nothing has been added from Matthew or Luke to complete it, and nothing from Luke to supply Matthew's deficiencies. Such are the appearances at the beginning and end of each; that which intervenes possesses the same character. Luke has much of importance which we seek in vain in the rest. This has remained peculiar to him, and no one has interpolated any of his journeys and parables into the other Evangelists. A considerable portion of his history has, as we shall soon be convinced (§ 41), been entirely lost, and yet no one has undertaken to fill up the consequent chasm by the aid of the other Gospels. Mark has omitted some narratives contained in Matthew; no interpolator has attempted to supply them. These prominent distinctive traits in each appear still untouched, and constitute an irrefragable proof that the ancient world never thought of completing the Gospels by means of interpolation.

(3.) When, at what period, was this interpolation undertaken? None of the Gospels were written before the latter half of the first century. It is not to be supposed that they were seized upon directly after their appearance under the very eyes of their authors, and subjected to this process of interpolation. And when attempts of this kind did begin to be made, they could be imparted merely to individual Mss., and could only gradually extend themselves in a limited sphere, in a particular region. All interpolations must have been confined to a particular dis-



strict of country, and could at most merely have gained admission into many Mss. in that district, before the period when the Recensions were made, and thus could never have attained universal currency. This, according to the natural course of things, must have been the fate of such interpolations. But even granting, in opposition to all observations of this character, that they did become universally known, and that all countries and nations showed themselves ready to alter their copies in conformity with the interpolated ones, and to destroy their ancient Mss. by means of which the earlier text would be propagated, and likewise that this was the case within a short period; at the close of the 2d century there had been a Syriac version executed in Asia, called the Peshito, in the west Latin versions, and not long after the Sahidic for Upper Egypt, all of which contain precisely what we are called upon to regard as interpolations. In what way could this uniformity have been produced in so short a time in such various and distant countries?

4. Not, however, to leave us wholly in the dark as to the manner in which these interpolations originated, at least in part, the public reading of the Gospels is stated to have been the cause of them. In reading, it is said, one Evangelist was sometimes connected with another and a lesson formed from the two.<sup>1</sup> Now if only one Gospel had been read, it would be admissible to suppose that passages might have been transferred into it from another, for the sake of obtaining a more complete narrative than was presented by the single Gospel. But each had its turn; no Gospel was debarred from being read, and consequently no motive existed for transferring to one of them what did not belong to it. On the other hand, the regular extent of the lessons would have been altered by such a procedure. The ancient lessons were long, comprehending several chapters, *τεράλεια, τίτλους*; unnecessary additions would have rendered them still longer, and the time appropriated to reading would be necessarily exceeded.

According to this representation, the interpolations were made incidentally, and not from any settled purpose accompanied by an ardent endeavor to extend them. So much the rather, then, must their extension have been gradual and slow; so much the longer time must have been required for their diffusion in foreign countries; and their universal reception, when surrendered to the operation of chance alone, must have required an almost interminable period; it could by no means have been effected in a short space of time.

5. An hypothesis of such a nature that its subject belongs to a period of antiquity not reached by any Mss. or even versions, possesses the advantage that they cannot refute it. Denial, it is true, is likewise very easy in such a case; but to support the denial is very difficult, as the topics for such support are but few, viz. internal grounds alone. These therefore should be the more relied on. Where an interpolation has been made, the following are the most important evidences of it. The first is a want of verbal connexion. When a number of sentences have no

<sup>1</sup> Dr. Gratz, *Krit.-Hist. Komment. über Matthæus*, I. Th. p. 531, 40, 68. II. Th. p. 500. The catalogues of church-lessons prefixed to Matthæi's edition of the New Testament cannot, however, be adduced in proof, inasmuch as they are taken almost wholly from *Evangeliaria*, and these contain small reading-lessons, like *Pericopæ*, which are of later origin.

connexion with the context, at either their beginning or end, an interpolation may be supposed, for in such a case it is possible. Yet this reason would be insufficient, if the circumstance occurred in the work of a writer who was not in the habit of preserving strict verbal connexion; or if the want of verbal connexion was supplied by one in the thought. A want of connexion in the thought would carry the critic further than a mere possibility. If a series of sentences were inconsistent with what preceded and followed, and the inconsistency could not be done away by any valid interpretation, we should be led to pronounce that some foreign matter had been interpolated. If in such a series of sentences a want of connexion in the language, likewise, could be shown, the proof of interpolation would be irrefragable.

Let us now test the alleged interpolations by these principles, in order to learn how far they are corroborated by them. That which is said to have been transferred from Luke into Matthew, or from Matthew into Luke, occurs in the same situation in both and in the same connexion. No interpolation therefore, can be detected on this score; the receiver and the giver appear precisely alike. Where a number of sentences in Luke are not made to occupy a corresponding place in Matthew, but are connected with different facts by the two writers, they suit the context in both Gospels, at least so well as to forbid us to say anything further than that they occur in a more natural situation in one than in the other. Little can be said of variations in phraseology, as the sentences agree almost always literally. But whenever there does occur even a trifling difference of this kind, it becomes still more evident that the language of Matthew was not transferred from Luke, or *vice versâ*; but that each followed his own peculiar style of expression. Luke generally evinces a taste for purity and elegance; Matthew on the contrary is more harsh and uses Hebrew idioms, as in the supposed interpolation, Matth. 8: 21. ἐπίτρεψόν μοι ποῦτον ἀπελθεῖν καὶ θάψαι, Luke 9: 59. ἐπίτρεψόν μοι ἀπελθόντι προῶτον θάψαι; and likewise Matth. 11: 8. οἱ τὰ μαλακὰ φοροῦντες ἐν τοῖς οἴκοις τῶν βασιλέων εἰσὶ, Luke 7: 25. οἱ ἐν ἱματισμῷ ἐνδύσθη καὶ τρυφῇ ὑπάρχοντες ἐν τοῖς βασιλείοις εἰσὶ. From such cases we should be led to conclude that when one forsook the phraseology of the other he expressed himself in his own way, rather than that any interpolation took place.

Whence now are we to infer an interpolation, if we cannot make it out from any want of verbal connexion, nor from a want of unity in the train of thought, nor from any difference in language? And if there be no ground to infer it, what becomes of such a supposition?

Semler's hypothesis of *conformations*, or attempts to harmonize, differs but little from the preceding; this has been lately brought into notice again and recommended by a writer of uncommon erudition.<sup>1</sup> It differs merely as to the motives which gave occasion to attempts which are of the same kind on both hypotheses. As according to the former supposition one Gospel was interpolated from another in order to render it complete, according to this the same thing was done from a desire to make them consonant with each other.

<sup>1</sup> Bertholdt, Hist.-Krit. Einleit. in die Schriften des A. und N. T. III. Th. § 329. p. 1249 seq.

But, if any persons were really induced to such an attempt, they had no very good reason for commencing with such passages as it is alleged that they did, passing by passages which called loudly for the employment of such an expedient, inasmuch as from them sceptics and opponents could charge the Gospels with real or apparent contradictions, or contest their historical veracity. Yet the passages of this character, which contained real or apparent contradictions (considered real by the enemies of the Gospels), have remained untouched. Rather than venture by a few strokes of the pen to harmonize these passages, the ancients suffered the objections against the Gospels to remain in them, and exposed themselves to the peril of not being able to answer them.

As that which was of most pressing importance has not been done, much less would they have troubled themselves about what was of no consequence. And admitting that without any sensible necessity they amused themselves with the employment of harmonizing, the harmony is but partial in the very passages for which the hypothesis is framed.

This theory has for its object the explanation of the same facts as the preceding. Hence the observations before made are applicable likewise here.

### § 39.

But why is it, since the later of these writers is said to have had the earlier before him, and to have incorporated entire passages from him into his own book, that he did not transfer them word for word? that in some clauses these Gospels agree to the letter, then deviate from each other, then return and proceed together? This question is asserted to be unanswerable without recourse to original Hebrew Gospels and Greek versions of them from which our historians drew. This inquiry has been the alleged occasion, and at the same time the foundation, of many well-known hypotheses. What then is the cause of such variations? The answer is obvious. These writers did not, in making use of each other, give up their individuality.

Their independence has been taken away and they have been denied the liberty of selecting in place of a particular expression one which was more habitual to them, or seemed more apposite; and instead of this they have had imputed to them unskillfulness in translating, which it was hoped would account better for the differences which are found between them. When this imputation was found not to serve the purpose intended, the *modicum* of skill in translation before accorded to them, was tacitly denied them, and they were provided with ready-made versions of the original Gospels, in which these variations already existed, and which they are said to have transcribed. Thus by degrees they have been degraded to the rank of mere copyists, as though it were contrary to all principles of criticism to suppose them to have had any free-will of their own.

Yet these variations maintain a peculiar character throughout each Gospel; and this circumstance shows clearly that they were designed and were the work of an independent hand. In Mark the clauses inserted tend to display concisely the feelings of the persons concerned, their demeanor and appearance. The single verse Mark 10: 16 con-

tains a complete picture ; see on the contrary Matth. 19: 15. To Matth. 19: 20, Mark has subjoined after *νεότητός μου* the words: *ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς ἐμβλέψας αὐτῷ, ἡγάπησεν αὐτὸν καὶ εἶπεν* (10: 21), which impart a natural beauty and vivacity to the narrative. In the same chapter (10: 14. Comp. Matth. 19: 14), he adds a momentary burst of feeling, *ἡγανάκησεν, καὶ εἶπεν*; so Mark 8: 12. Matth. 12: 39; and in another place: *ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς σπλαγχνισθεὶς*, Mark 1: 41. Comp. Matth. 8: 3; Mark 3: 5. Matth. 12: 10, 11, *καὶ περιβλεψάμενος μετ' ὕργης*; and *ἡ δὲ γυνὴ φοβηθεῖσα καὶ τρέμουσα*, 5: 33. Matth. 9: 22; *ἀποβαλὼν τὸ ἱμάτιον αὐτοῦ, ἀναστὰς ἦλθε*, 10: 50. Matth. 20: 32; 9: 20 and 26. Matth. 17: 18; Mark 10: 22. Matth. 20: 17, and many other like cases. It is not our purpose to consider in this place how he could make additions thus, not having seen any of these things himself; but it is a satisfaction to discover here again the voucher of the author, and to find a new confirmation of the fact that Mark did not derive his accounts from a second or third hand, but wrote down the statements of an eye-witness who preserved a vivid remembrance of the past, and gave some finishing touches to the narrative as lively as though that past were to his imagination present. Sometimes he called to mind the particular Aramæan words employed by our Lord in working a miracle; as e. g. *Talitha koumi*, i. e. *maid arise*, and that to the deaf and dumb person, *Ephphatha*, i. e. *be opened*. (Mark 5: 41. 7: 34).

In altering the phraseology merely, in adding words, exchanging some for others, amplifying sentences or inserting clauses, he shows his anxiety to be perspicuous and definite. This anxiety caused him to add to Matth. 3: 6, after *ἐν τῷ Ἰορδάνῃ* the word *ποταμῷ* (1: 5), and to *τὸ δάσος* in Matth. 8: 4. *περὶ τοῦ καθαρισμοῦ*. (1: 44.) In 1: 42, he inserts *εἰπόντος αὐτοῦ* to denote the instantaneousness of the result. In the 2d chapter, verses 8, 16, 18, and 21, there are changes and amplifications for the sake of perspicuity. Verse 3: 30 is an explanatory addition to Matth. 12: 31, 32; as 6: 18 explains Matth. 14: 4. *οὐκ ἔξεστί σοι ἔχειν αὐτήν*. So Mark 8: 19, *οὐκ εἰς τὴν καρδίαν* is explanatory of Matth. 15: 17; and Mark 8: 19, 20, *πλήρεις κλασμάτων* of Matth. 16: 9, 10. *πόσους κοφίνους*. Mark 12: 26, *ἐπὶ τοῦ βᾶτον* is explanatory; as well as 13: 3, *κατέναντι τοῦ ἱεροῦ*, which gives us to understand what caused a renewal of the conversation. So too 14: 12, *ὅτι τὸ πάσχα ἔθνον*, compared with Matth. 26: 17; also Mark 14: 56, 57, compared with Matth. 26: 60, 61; and *περικαλύπτειν τὸ πρόσωπον* in 14: 65, without which the word *προφήτευσον* in Matth. 26: 68 would be unintelligible, etc. etc.

In Luke we perceive an endeavor to be peculiarly concise in his language. Mark 1: 22. Luke 4: 32, *ὅτι ἐν ἐξουσίᾳ ἦν ὁ λόγος αὐτοῦ*; Mark 1: 28. Luke 4: 37, *καὶ ἐξεπορεύετο ὁ ἄγγελος περὶ αὐτοῦ εἰς πάντα τόπον τῆς περιχώρου*; Mark 2: 15, 16. Luke 5: 29, 30; Mark 3: 31—35. Luke 8: 19—21; Mark 4: 5—9. Luke 8: 6—8; Mark 9: 6. Luke 9: 33. *μὴ εἰδώς ὃ λέγει*; Mark 4: 30—32. Luke 13: 18, 19; Mark 5: 2—15. Luke 8: 27—34; Mark 11: 15, 16, 17. Luke 19: 45, 46; Mark 13: 1, 2. Luke 21: 5, 6; Mark 14: 16. Luke 22: 13. *ἀπελθόντες δὲ εὗρον καθὼς εἶρηκεν αὐτοῖς*.

Luke is further distinguished by his attention to elegance of diction. How harsh is the following clause in Mark 12: 38, *τῶν θελούντων ἐν*



στολαῖς περιπατεῖν, καὶ ἀσπασμούς ἐν ταῖς ἀγοραῖς? Luke inserts a single word: καὶ γιγλύνειν ἀσπασμούς, and the sentence is easy and flowing. The passage Matth. 8. 9, ἄνθρωπός εἰμι ὑπὸ ἐξουσίαν, ἔχων ὑπὲρ ἐμαυτὸν σιτατιώτας, is not only harsh but obscure, and misled some of the old translators. Luke remedies it completely by inserting one word, ὑπὸ ἐξουσίαν τασσόμενος (7: 8). The expression in Matth. 21: 26, πάντες γὰρ ἔχουσι τὸν Ἰωάννην ὡς προφήτην, is not Greek; Mark (11: 32) attempts to remedy it; Luke deviates from both for the purpose of giving a Greek turn to the clause: ὁ λαὸς—πεπεισμένος γὰρ ἔστιν, Ἰωάννην προφήτην εἶναι (20: 6). So too he alters Matth. 11: 8, οἱ τὰ μαλακὰ φοροῦντες, to the advantage of its accuracy and elegance: οἱ ἐν ἱματισμῷ ἐνδόξῳ καὶ τρυφῇ ὑπάρχοντες. (7: 25). For ὑπερέεις (Matth. 5: 25) Luke puts (12: 58) the legal term πράκτωρ. The construction of Mark 12: 44 is rendered more conformable to Greek usage by Luke (21: 4): αὕτη δὲ ἐκ τοῦ ὑστερήματος αὐτῆς ἅπαντα τὸν βίον ὃν εἶχεν ἔβαλε. Sometimes, too, he avoids a Hebraism. Mark 8: 36, ἐὰν κερδήσῃ τὸν κόσμον ὅλον καὶ ζημιωθῇ ἑνὲν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ, is given by Luke (9: 25), κερδήσας τὸν κόσμον ὅλον, ἑαυτὸν (ἰψῆ) δὲ ἀπολέσας, ἢ ζημιωθεῖς; Mark 12: 20, 21, 22, οὐκ ἀφῆκε σπέρμα. Luke 20: 28, 29, ἀπέθανεν ἄτεκνος; Matth. 8: 27, ἐθαύμασαν. Mark 4: 41, ἐφοβήθησαν φόβον μέγαν. Luke 8: 25, φοβηθέντες δὲ ἐθαύμασαν, not only avoiding the Hebraism, but elegantly connecting the two words.

The constantly recurring εὐθέως, καὶ εὐθέως, is one of Mark's striking peculiarities; the word παρρησία instead, is not much less striking in Luke, both in the Gospel and Acts. So the constant use of the particle τότε is a peculiarity of Matthew. Among Matthew's peculiarities, too, we may reckon the use of ἀποκριθεῖς without any antecedent question, Matth. 11: 25. 17: 4. 22: 1. 26: 63. 27: 21. 28: 5; as, likewise, the perpetually occurring ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν, while Luke uses only λέγω ὑμῖν, or ἀληθῶς λέγω ὑμῖν, Luke 11: 27. 12: 44. 21: 3, and ἐπ' ἀληθείας λέγω ὑμῖν (4: 24). The individuality of these writers is so clearly apparent that no great pains are necessary to make it conceivable how in the course of coincident passages one could alter the phraseology, insert words and brief clauses, and in short follow his own inclination and habits.

## § 40.

As to the succession of events, Luke coincides with Mark against the arrangement of Matthew, and this confirms the idea that Mark revised Matthew with reference to his chronology, and made it a point to observe more strictly the order of actual succession, since Luke, in proposing his plan at the commencement of his book, reckons the observance of the natural order as one of his duties.

## FIRST JOURNEY.

*Luke.*

I. Jesus goes to Capernaum and heals a demoniac.

II. Enters Simon's house.

III. Enters Simon's ship, who had toiled all night and taken nothing.

IV. Heals a leper.

*Mark.*

I. Jesus goes to Capernaum and heals a demoniac.

II. Enters Simon's house.

III. Heals a leper.

## SECOND JOURNEY.

*Luke.*

I. Four men bring one sick of the palsy.

II. Jesus calls Levi.

III. The disciples of John fast.

IV. The disciples of Jesus go through the corn-fields.

*Mark.*

I. Four men bring one sick of the palsy.

II. Jesus calls Levi.

III. The disciples of John fast.

IV. The disciples of Jesus go through the corn-fields.

## THIRD JOURNEY.

*Luke.*

I. A man with a withered hand is healed.

II. Jesus chooses the twelve.

III. He cures the centurion's servant.

IV. He goes to Nain; restores the widow's son to life.

V. The disciples of John inquire whether Jesus is he that should come.

VI. The woman who was a sinner anoints Jesus in the Pharisee's house.

VII. Jesus heals demoniacs; utters the parable of the sower.

VIII. His mother and brethren arrive.

IX. He sleeps in the storm; arrives at Gadaris. Story of the demoniac.

X. Jesus heals the daughter of Jairus.

*Mark.*

I. A man with a withered hand is healed.

II. Jesus chooses the twelve.

III. Jesus is charged with healing through Beelzebub.

IV. His mother and brethren arrive; he utters the parable of the sower.

V. He sleeps in the storm; arrives at Gadaris. Story of the demoniac.

VI. Jesus heals the daughter of Jairus.

In the first Journey, event No. III is wholly peculiar to Luke, and not touched upon by Mark; as likewise No. IV in the third Journey. The incidents III and V in the third Journey are related by Matthew; Mark, however, removed them from their position and did not insert them in any other place. The procedure of Luke, who has connected them with wholly different occurrences and chronological circumstances, completely justifies Mark in removing them from their connexion in Matthew. Event No. VI is repeated by John (12: 1 seq.), who unites the circumstances mentioned separately by Mark and Luke, and even their phraseology, into one whole; whence it is evident that the narrative in Mark 14: 3 and that of Luke 7: 36 have reference to the same event.

The accusation that Jesus healed through Beelzebub is mentioned by Luke at a later stage of the history (11: 14); but in the place it occupies in Mark, Luke speaks in general language of the cure of demons by the miraculous power of Jesus. Mark has united the parables of the sower and the grain of mustard seed; Luke separates them and presents the latter in a different connexion (13: 17—21).

As to the occurrence in regard to the centurion, he exhibits the ground of his assigning it the position which it occupies; for he designates the time by saying that after this had happened Jesus went *ἐν τῇ ἑξῆς*, on the following day, to Nain (7: 11). The question of John's disciples, which stands completely isolated in Matthew (11: 2), is connected by Luke with the restoration of the widow's son to life at Nain; and this occurrence is represented as the occasion of John's sending his disciples to make the inquiry (Luke 7: 17). It is clear also from the answer of Jesus, even as given in Matthew, that the miracle of raising the dead had already taken place; for Jesus expressly refers to it (Matth. 11: 5): Say, the blind receive their sight, and the lame walk, the lepers are cleansed, and the deaf hear, the dead are raised up, &c. Luke, therefore, was guided by chronological reasons in giving these incidents the position which they occupy in his book. He introduced anew the facts which Mark took out of their connexion in Matthew and neglected to insert elsewhere; but he presents them in a different, viz. their real, order.

The same is the case, too, as to an occurrence which is inaccurately assigned by Matthew to the early part of Jesus' ministry (8: 19), and narrated directly after the visit to Peter's house. The incident referred to is, that a certain man was desirous of following Jesus, but was first informed of the difficulties in the way of such a design. Mark has omitted this account, too, as well as the preceding, because it had not its proper position in the order of time. Luke, however, designates the place and period of the occurrence, removing it far along in the history to the time when Jesus was on his way to Jerusalem through Samaria (9: 51—58). Again, his separating the parables of the sower and the grain of mustard seed, (which seem to have been united by Mark on account of their similarity), and assigning them distinct situations in his book, can be explained only by his attention to strict chronological order. On the other hand, however, one fact (7: 37 seq.), the story of the woman that was a sinner who anointed Jesus, is assigned too early a position, as we may convince ourselves from comparing John.

In the *Fourth Journey* they coincide with each other, as may be seen from the following comparison.

*Luke.**Mark.*

I. Jesus calls the twelve together.

II. Herod believes that John is risen.

III. The disciples of Jesus return from their mission.

IV. Five thousand are fed.

I. Jesus calls the twelve together.

II. Herod believes that John is risen.

III. The disciples of Jesus return from their mission.

IV. Five thousand are fed.

+

## § 41.

Here, however, Luke omits a whole chain of events which occur in both Matthew and Mark. Soon after he joins them again, and accompanies them step by step.

The occurrences omitted are the following: The disciples of Jesus are on the sea, their master appears to them, goes to them into the ship, and they arrive at Gennesareth (Mark 6: 45. Matth. 14: 23). The Pharisees find fault with the disciples of Jesus for eating with unwashen hands (Mark 7: 1). Jesus comes into the borders of Tyre and Sidon, and heals the daughter of the believing Canaanitess (7: 24). Jesus heals a deaf and dumb person with spittle (7: 31). Four thousand are fed (8: 1 seq.) The Pharisees require a sign of Jesus; the disciples are charged to beware of the leaven of the Pharisees; a blind man is healed (8: 22). All this is wanting in Luke; but henceforth he proceeds with the others.

*Luke.**Mark.*

I. Jesus asks, Whom do men say that I am?

II. Is transfigured on the mount.

III. The disciples are not able to heal a demoniac.

IV. They dispute who should be greatest in the kingdom of God.

V. John relates that a person is casting out devils in the name of Jesus.

I. Jesus asks, Whom do men say that I am?

II. Is transfigured on the mount.

III. The disciples are not able to heal a demoniac.

IV. They dispute who should be greatest in the kingdom of God.

V. John relates that a person is casting out devils in the name of Jesus.

It is contrary to the custom of this writer wholly to omit any event; he always introduces again those narratives in Matthew which are excluded by Mark, and assigns them a different position in the course of the history. Hence the phenomenon we have mentioned is not to be explained from this quarter.

On further examination as to the portion of the history wanting in Luke, we find that he has removed the occurrence in relation to the re-



quirement of a sign, and placed it further along at a late period, in 11: 29, and the warning against the leaven of the Pharisees still further along (12: 1), in a different connexion.

After these events were separated from the rest, the series of occurrences found in the other Evangelists and wanting in Luke concluded with the feeding of the four thousand; the event which immediately preceded this series was the feeding of the five thousand. Now Luke connects with the miracle of the five thousand (11: 12 and 18) what in the other Evangelists does not occur till after the later miracle of the four thousand (Matth. 15: 32, and 16: 13. Mark 8: 1, 27). We have, therefore, a *Homoiteleton* to explain this phenomenon.

That this portion of the history was very early lost may be inferred from the fact that it is not preserved in a single Ms. Had copies been extensively circulated previously, the mistake would not have been universal, and the portion which is wanting must have been preserved in some country or in some Ms. at least.

We have probably lost in this way, not only what we are informed of by his predecessors (in that case the loss would be of no consequence), but likewise some of the events of Jesus' life, as well as instructions given by him, with which Luke often enriches his biography from his own resources.

In the Acts he tells us of a saying of our Lord (20: 35, δεῖ μνημονεύειν τῶν λόγων τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ, ὅτι αὐτὸς εἶπε· μακάριόν ἐστι διδόναι μᾶλλον ἢ λαμβάνειν), respecting which he is silent in his Gospel; and it was certainly connected with some memorable event, parable or discourse, and would have been a peculiar ornament to his history. It appears to me more probable that this passage was contained in the portion of the history which is lost, and suffered the same fate with it, than that he forgot or omitted it.

We know that there are still found in the oldest fathers sentences for which we search in vain in our present historical books; e. g., one in the Epistle to Barnabas (c. 8), οὕτω φησὶ, οἱ θέλοντές με ἰδεῖν, καὶ ἄψασθαί μου τῆς βασιλείας, ὀφείλουσι θλίβοντες καὶ παθόντες λαβεῖν με; but I do not venture to affirm that they were derived from the lost portion of Luke's original work.

## § 42.

After the omission of this portion of the history, the Evangelists unite again, and Luke proceeds in harmony with Mark, as is shown by the table given in the preceding section. But this extends no further than is there represented. Thenceforward Luke is generally independent of the rest of the Evangelists, and introduces us to entirely new and unknown scenes.

All the other Evangelists here commence the account of the last journey to Jerusalem; Luke proceeds otherwise. He informs us three times that Jesus purposed to go to Jerusalem, and each time describes the journey itself a little way. But while we are thinking to see Jesus soon in Jerusalem, we unexpectedly find him elsewhere, and in fact further away from Jerusalem than at the commencement of his journey.

In 9: 51 he says: "When the time was come that he should be received up, he steadfastly set his face to go to Jerusalem." Jesus then passes through Samaria, which was on the road travelled by the pilgrim from Galilee to Jerusalem. In Samaria his disciples wish to call down fire from heaven (52—56). The narrative is then continued, till at length Jesus arrives at the dwelling-place of Matthew and Mary, which according to the other Evangelists was Bethany (10: 38). Of Jerusalem itself Luke says not a word, but speaks generally of his abode *ἐν τόπῳ τινί* (11: 1), and tells us of a conversation respecting a certain occurrence which to all appearance happened in Jerusalem at the feast (13: 1).

Jesus is unexpectedly again in Galilee, and commences anew a journey thence to Jerusalem (13: 22, *ἦν πορείαν ποιούμενος εἰς Ἱερουσαλήμ*.) He proceeds onward, Luke relating a multitude of discourses and events.<sup>1</sup> For the second time, however, he does not lead our Lord to the place to which he was going; but when he should have arrived there, he abruptly tells us of another purposed journey to the holy city.

He takes the twelve and says, Behold we go up to Jerusalem (18: 31). He then proceeds along the Jordan, and arrives by way of Jericho (18: 35) at the capital, the scene of his death, which is narrated with its accompanying circumstances.

We have here only accounts of journeys, without learning their issue, or what occurred in the place whither they were directed; in fact without learning whether Jesus reached the place of his destination. It would seem, or rather it is plain, that we have here no connected history, but detached fragments, or if the word be preferred, *collectanea*, which the writer presented as his investigations furnished them. Thus much may we say at present respecting the general plan of this book, and we now pass to consider the work more particularly.

### § 43.

In the narratives which are common to Matthew and Mark, Luke coincides with Mark in the representation of minute circumstances. In the story of the woman with the issue of blood, Mark places the miracle in a peculiar light, by informing us of the woman's long and fruitless endeavors to get rid of the malady, her expenditure and the efforts of physicians for the purpose; he adds the dialogue that arose between Jesus and his disciples respecting the woman's touching him; describes with minuteness the woman's behaviour, her terror and confusion, etc. Luke also relates the occurrence with all these circumstances, and in describing the woman's terror uses phraseology very similar to that of Mark.

Take the story of the daughter of Jairus, which is connected with the preceding. In Matth. 9: 18, the ruler says immediately on his arrival: My daughter is even now dead. In Mark 5: 23 seq. she is represented as only at the point of death; and after the incident respecting the woman with the issue of blood, messengers arrive who announce her death.

<sup>1</sup> 18: 11 does not begin a new journey; but, as the words clearly mean, merely continues the one undertaken: *ἐγένετο δὲ ἐν τῷ πορεύεσθαι αὐτὸν εἰς τὴν Ἱερουσαλήμ*. This was to be remarked so that no doubt might arise from the passage.

On this information Jesus encourages the father, etc. Luke represents the whole in the same way (8: 40 seq). Comp. Matth. 8: 1—5. and Mark 1: 40.—end. Luke 5: 12—17.—Matth. 9: 1—8. Mark 2: 3—13. Luke 5: 18—27.—Matth. 17: 14—19. Mark 9: 14—30. Luke 9: 37—43, and many other passages.

The precise designations of numbers in Mark, who pays more attention to them than Matthew, are adopted by Luke, who thus confirms their accuracy. In the story of the demoniacs at Gadaris (Matth. 8: 28), Matthew mentions two, while Mark mentions but one; and Luke follows the example of the latter (8: 27. Mark 5: 2). The account of the two blind men on the road to Jericho (Matth. 22: 30) is made by Mark to refer to but one (Mark 10: 46); so likewise by Luke (18: 35).

### § 44.

He has sometimes illustrated a narrative by new circumstances and been more definite in its detail (e. g. Matth. 8: 19—23. Luke 9: 57—end.—Matth. 8: 5—11. Luke 7: 2—9); and has here and there corrected certain statements of his predecessors. Matthew and Mark have represented the period of time, from the discourse which ends with the words: *λέγω ὑμῖν, εἰσὶ τινες τῶν ὧδε ἐσχηκότων, οἵτινες οὐ μὴ γεύσονται θανάτου* (Matth. 16: 28. Mark 9: 1) to the transfiguration, as six days; while Luke makes it eight (9: 27, 28).

Matthew relates (27: 44), that the malefactors who were crucified with our Lord reviled him; Mark permitted this to remain as he found it in his predecessor (15: 33). But Luke inquired into the circumstances anew, and informs us that one of them rebuked the other for daring to revile Jesus (23: 39—43). This was remarked by Manes, the well-known heretic of the third century, with the design of fastening the imputation of discrepancy on the Evangelists.<sup>1</sup>

Matthew tells us of but one angel who addressed the women when they visited the sepulchre (28: 2). Mark follows Matthew (16: 5). The account given by Luke runs differently, for according to him there were two (24: 4); and John so distinctly confirms the accuracy of this representation, as even to designate the place in which each was seen (20: 12).

The supposition made to reconcile these different accounts, which is founded on a common original Hebrew or Syriac text out of which they were all translated, is a proof to us that this theory may indeed afford opportunity for philological ingenuity, but can give little assistance in a case of real perplexity. If the original contained *ܐܝܢܐ*, it is true

that it might be read *ܐܝܢܐ* or *ܐܝܢܐ*; but, though it is easy to see how one writer might have rendered it *ἀνὴρ* and another *ἄνδρες*, it is not so easy to see how Luke could have translated *δύο ἄνδρες*. Not to men-

<sup>1</sup> In Epiphan. Hær. LXVI. n. 40. *Καὶ γὰρ εἰς τῶν εὐαγγελιστῶν λέγει, ὅτι οἱ ληστὰς οἱ συνεσταυρωμένοι ἐβλασφημοῦν αὐτόν. Ὁ δὲ ἄλλος οὐχ ὅτι μόνον οὐκ ἐβλασφημοῦν οἱ ἀμφοτέροι, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἀπολογία τοῦ ἐνὸς σημαίνει. Καὶ γὰρ ἐπετίμα τῷ ἐτέρῳ καὶ ἔλεγεν, ὅτι οὐ φοβῇ σὺ τὸν Θεόν, ὅτι ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ κρίματι ἐσμεν, οὗτος δὲ ἅγιος οὐδὲν ἐποίησε, κ. τ. λ.*

tion, that even supposing all verbs to have been as participles *in statu emphatico*, there must have been in Matthew a noun which, if the original were not obscure from set purpose, would have contained something definite as to the singular or plural number; not to dwell on this, the relative pronouns (*ἡ ἰδέα αὐτοῦ* and *ἐνδύμα αὐτοῦ*) are decisive as to the number.

It is plain that Luke has improved upon his predecessors in this case; but he has not contradicted them. With regard to Matthew we have been sufficiently explicit, and have shown from his plan, that, neglecting minor circumstances, he has given a summary narration of facts to prove that Jesus fulfilled what was foretold in the Old Testament. There would be an evident contradiction of Mark, likewise, unless we were in judging to take into account his plan and the origin of his book. Mark wrote what Peter delivered in his discourses. He noted down what the Apostle said in his expositions of Matthew's Gospel, and put the whole together in a work which appeared as his own. When the Apostle added nothing to a passage, a word or an occurrence; when, accidentally or otherwise, he omitted to make any observation, the passage remained as it was in Matthew; and Mark, who according to the ancients confined himself to his teacher's information, and wrote and published only that, is neither guilty of falsehood nor mistake in his narrative. Luke is indeed more accurate, but this is all; and even the unfriendly critic can never charge Mark with deviations from truth or contradiction of the rest.

### § 45.

Such events as were related with all their minute circumstances by his predecessors, he often condenses as did Mark, and touches upon them but slightly. Such e. g. is the narrative in Luke 9: 46; Matthew had already related it with sufficient minuteness (18: 1), and Mark had made an addition of several minor circumstances to his account, which rendered it more accurate and graphic. Luke, then, may have thought it superfluous to dilate further on an event which was exhausted, and concerning which he had nothing new to offer. Not wishing barely to repeat what had been already said, and unwilling to omit any thing, he gives a brief notice of it, concluding with the language of Mark. Luke 9: 48. Mark 9: 37. See also Luke 9: 7—9, compared with Matth. 14: 1, and Mark 6: 14.—Luke 10: 25—29, compare Mark 12: 28—35.

Jesus warns his disciples (Matth. 16: 5 and Mark 8: 14) to beware of the leaven of the Pharisees. The warning was misunderstood, till Jesus more clearly explained his meaning. Now this occurrence appears at length in the first two Evangelists; Luke, however, notices it in but few words, thus showing that he presumed it to be well known, and that it properly belonged to this period; and instead of giving the debate at length, presents the decision of it at once. Even this, indeed, is abbreviated, for all he says respecting it is: *He began to say unto his disciples first of all, Beware ye of the leaven of the Pharisees, which is hypocrisy* (Luke 12: 1).



## § 46.

The analysis we have made of the three works on the lineage and ministry of our Lord, has now put us in a condition to meet the hypothesis by which a distinguished scholar has attempted to explain the origin of the Gospels; the principal position of which is, that Mark compiled his work from the commentaries of Matthew and Luke,<sup>1</sup> and consequently did not write till after them.

Let us consider the arguments adduced in its support. The agreement of Matthew and Mark in selecting the same events from the abundant materials afforded them for differing from each other in this respect, certainly proves that these two Evangelists did not write independently of each other, but determines nothing concerning the priority of either.

What is alleged, too, in support of the other position in regard to Luke, viz. that he and Mark generally agree in the detailed representation of facts and differ from Matthew, is very true; but it is equally as proper to infer from this that Luke copied from Mark as the opposite. Supposing Mark to have made Matthew and Luke the basis of his work and to have aimed to unite both into one, he would have proceeded very differently; or to reverse the statement, supposing the writer's endeavor to have corresponded with his purpose, nothing of the kind can be inferred from his procedure.

Luke is distinguished for the number of events he narrates which are wholly unnoticed in Matthew. The great number of important and entirely new facts which he presents confers especial value on his work. Had Mark been acquainted with his work and intended from it together with Matthew to execute a third, he could not have so entirely neglected and omitted what was most important in Luke as to have availed himself of but a few (§ 30) of his many historical discoveries. We should rather have expected him to choose what was most important in both Luke and Matthew, and divide his selection between the two.

Now this was not the case; he directs his attention only to the facts in Matthew, and consequently the proofs we have go only to argue the use of Matthew. Whatever aim in respect to his peculiar readers we suppose Mark to have had in the composition of his work, it must in any case be strange that he could find among the many accounts and discourses in Luke almost nothing of any use towards his object, and on the other hand could avail himself of almost every thing in Matthew.

If, moreover, he took the facts from Matthew and the circumstantial detail of them from Luke, as must have been the case, there is nothing of Mark's own in his whole book, and we must therefore allow that he has done nothing as an author, but has merely compiled what any one might have read in Matthew and Luke, and that he undertook and performed for no possible purpose an entirely superfluous task.

---

<sup>1</sup> The Whitsuntide Programm of the University of Jena in 1789, by Prof. Griesbach, supports this thesis: "Marci Evangelium totum e Matthæi et Lucæ commentariis decerptum esse."

I must now bestow some particular attention upon a more recent position, taken by a learned man who in other respects coincides very nearly with myself. He regards Luke as the first of the Evangelists.<sup>1</sup>

The principal argument which he adduces to substantiate his position is, that if Matthew wrote before Luke the latter would scarcely have presumed to compose a Gospel after him, on account of the weight of apostolic authority. True, the authority of an apostle was great; hence arose the respectful diffidence of Luke and the modest apology with which he opens his book. (Comp. above § 33).

This learned man finds a second strong point in the remark that Luke would not have omitted any part of Matthew, had he possessed his work. He has not omitted any part of it, except the history of the childhood of Jesus, for which he richly indemnifies us by other facts (I—III). The deficiency of the portion of history before mentioned (§ 40), which was omitted by the copyist in the very first Mss. on account of the *Homoiooteleuton*, cannot be laid to the author's charge. He has even carefully distributed the individual sentences in the (so-called) sermon on the mount into eighteen or nineteen different places in his book, where they all occur in a perfectly natural connexion; while in Matthew there is such a striking want of connexion in the discourse that we cannot but discern the juxta-position of detached sentences. He has even restored those passages which Mark omitted, because in Matthew they had not their proper position. (Comp. above § 29, 37, and 40). He invariably presents not only Matthew's materials, but Mark's; from the last of whom he has not neglected to take the very three events in regard to which he was more copious than Matthew (§ 30).

Let us now consider the matter in another light. How much more copious is Luke than Matthew? Not to be prolix, we will only notice the two remarkable journeys to Jerusalem (11: 51 and 13: 22), of which we are informed by Luke alone; and of these we will only notice the parables. The first is the beautiful parable of the man who on his way to Jericho fell among thieves (10: 30); then comes the one respecting a person who awoke his friend at night and importunately asked bread of him (11: 5 seq.). Then the parables of the lost sheep, of the woman who lost a piece of money, and of the prodigal son (15: 1—end); the story of the rich man and Lazarus (16: 19); of the widow who by her importunity obtained justice of the unjust judge (17: 1 seq.); and the parables of the publican and Pharisee praying (17: 10). All these valuable things belong to Luke exclusively. Could he have resigned these to oblivion, even if all the apostles had written before him? Was he not bound to present this supplement to his fellow-christians? On the other hand, why is it that Matthew, if he wrote after Luke, has not said a word of these things, not even hinted at them in his brief way, that at least he might crown these valuable passages with his testimony and confirmation?

It is replied that he did not wish to write any thing of which he was not an eye-witness. Very well; but a quarter of his sermon on the mount, when it is distributed according to its historical connexion, falls

<sup>1</sup> Vogel, "Über die Entstehung der drey ersten Evangelien," in Gabler's "Journal für auserles. theol. Litteratur." I Bd. I. St. p. 804

in these parts of Luke ; hence he must have been present at these occurrences or he could not have introduced into his book the sayings connected with them. In the third journey, too, he even passes over in silence the incident in respect to Zaccheus; and yet the Apostle was present at the conversion of his former colleague, for all the twelve were with our Lord. This reply therefore is not satisfactory.

Once more, then ; if Luke preceded Matthew, why has not the latter attested anew the copious narrative of the former ? Why has he neglected to notice, at least briefly, so much that is valuable in him ? Why is it that he has not availed himself at all of his accurate chronology, to which, as appears from the promise in his introduction, Luke devoted special pains ? Why did he neglect to make any use of the agreeable particularity with which Luke has enlivened the events he narrates, or of the many corrections he has made ? In one word, why does he fall so far short of the point of perfection to which the history had reached before him ?

### § 47.

It is perceived from what I have urged against these learned men, that the succession of the Evangelists which we have adopted is not arbitrarily assumed, but is founded on what we observe to be the plan and procedure of each.

The order of succession of several historical writers who did not write at the same time and were not unacquainted with each other's works, if it be not definitely stated in the history, may be determined in two ways. A writer who has been preceded, either presents nothing but additions or supplements to the previous history, from which it may be inferred what and how much he regarded as already known, and what works his procedure proves to have been antecedent to his ; or else he does not content himself with supplements merely, but repeats the old account, and adds what is his own in its proper place.

Three of the Evangelists relate the same things ; consequently two have repeated what was before narrated. Now which of the three works has most the appearance of priority ? Which has, in general, the marks in point of matter and manner of being the first historical attempt ? which writer has arranged facts most negligently ? most frequently disposed them according to the principle of analogy ? least anxiously investigated the exact and particular circumstances of events ? Which has more carefully assigned events to their proper period and arranged them more precisely in their real order ? more carefully ascertained minute circumstances ? described the facts more definitely and rigorously, and presented them more fully and vividly ? Which, lastly, is most accurate of all in the chronological arrangement of events ? most precise in his statements ? most abundant in facts ? most comprehensive and complete in his materials and his mode of using them ?

This gradation in the perfection of the *same* history enables us readily to determine which was the earlier and which the later writer. This discloses the order in which they succeeded each other ; and in this case it proves the very same order which history presented us at the outset and antiquity unanimously supported ; under the guidance of which we se-

lected our point of observation, uncertain whether it would prove to be correct or not in the sequel.

Considering the Evangelists in this order, all those difficulties which have led to other opinions are easily resolved. It is perfectly clear that Mark might have seen Matthew, and yet arrange many events differently, place many in a peculiar light by means of particular circumstances, and so represent some things as apparently to contradict Matthew. So, likewise, how Luke might have seen Mark, and yet be frequently still more accurate in his arrangement, in statements of time, place, and circumstances; and how, notwithstanding his copiousness, he is sometimes more concise than he would have been had he not been aware of the particularity of his predecessor.

All these and like difficulties which are presented in support of recently proposed theories vanish of themselves when we try them by this theory, the points of which are confirmed by history and by a critical analysis of the writings under examination.

### § 48.

Luke, therefore, found the works of Matthew and Mark, together with various others relative to the life, ministry, and acts of our Lord, already in existence. Let us now see what he himself accomplished.

In the discourses of Jesus Luke adheres to Matthew invariably, even in phraseology. This is seldom the case in his narratives. Mark does the same in regard to our Lord's discourses. We could not take into consideration the reason of this before; but we must no longer defer doing so. It may be regarded as introductory to our promised summary of what Luke has done.

Matthew was led to compose his Gospel by the condition and wants of a period in which the Jewish state was hastening to its dissolution. The interval between the days of Jesus and that period, was too great for human memory to recall with accuracy all that he who was the subject of the history did and said. Events are least liable to escape the recollection, particularly the recollection of an eye-witness, or one to whom they have been vividly represented by eye-witnesses; but it is more perilous to trust the phraseology of sayings and discourses to the memory alone.

The former, indeed, it is probable Matthew did trust to his memory; the rather as the idea of writing a history of our Lord did not suggest itself to him till a later period. But the elevated doctrines and wise sayings of his master had greater claim upon his attention, and it was important that they should be always before his mind in his ministry. To accomplish this object he was prompted and enabled by his official habit of recording, an advantage not possessed by the others; and it is the fact that the notes which he made were the ground-work of his Gospel, as we may infer from internal evidence which it contains. In moral sayings and parables Matthew abounds to overflowing. Frequently they are arranged merely according to the principle of resemblance. The parables, moral sayings, and exhortations, arranged simply according to the similarity of their scope, bear evident marks of having been extracted from some collection. As he was not obliged to use any aid of others in making his original notes, his book was regarded by his



successors as an authentic source of information in respect to the discourses of Jesus.

On the other hand, events wear an appearance of accident in his book, more than in the others. He does, indeed, sometimes present them circumstantially; oftener, however, only in outline, just as he found them in his notes. With this course he might very well content himself, as his purpose required nothing more. It was the object of Mark's endeavors to complete Matthew's narratives, to arrange them in chronological order, and to assign discourses the position to which they belonged, so far as he who was his authority could aid him in doing so.

Meanwhile the fate of Palestine was decided. Christianity ceased its connexion with the Jewish state, was released from all regard to Judaism, and declared herself independent of its institutions. Those who were half Jews were displeased at this, separated themselves, and, as it would seem, composed their own Gospels; we refer to the Gospels of the Nazarenes and Ebionites. Others collected the rubbish of early traditions on historic ground; and thus were produced the works of the *many*.

This was probably about the state of things, when Luke felt himself called upon to clear away from the field of history all unauthenticated accounts. Matthew was his manual as to the discourses of our Lord, and he adhered to it literally, although he has distributed the discourses about in various places, inserting them in the history in detached parts, and connecting them so happily that the occasion of their utterance is perfectly and agreeably evident. He has not, however, taken any facts directly from Matthew, except those which Mark has omitted; and he has given these an entirely different arrangement.

He has chosen Mark as his guide in two respects, viz. in the succession of events, where Mark differs from Matthew in his arrangement, and in the circumstantial narration of facts. He does not, however, adhere wholly to him; he did not shun the trouble of illustrating or enriching a narrative himself, by adding new circumstances when he could do so. Circumstances which were susceptible of correction, and had remained in Mark because they were so in Matthew, have been stated more accurately by him. On the other hand when there was nothing to be added or corrected, he contented himself with giving an outline of the narrative, on the ground that it had been fully exhibited in a previous work.

Some facts which were new and as yet untouched, he inserted in their proper order and connexion. The following important accounts are presented us by him alone; the history of Jesus' youth, intermingled with passages of fine poetic and religious fervor; two remarkable journeys to Jerusalem, comprising many important doctrines and parables and many striking descriptions; and the history of what befell the disciples from the resurrection to the ascension. It is probable that with the portion of the history that has disappeared, extending from the feeding of the five thousand to that of the four thousand, much has been lost with which he enriched and improved the accounts of his predecessors. However this may be, the enlargement of the history by his means, the advance it made both in important and in trifling respects, are so plain to every one, that we have no need of the lost portion in order to acknowledge and appreciate them.

How much he adopted into his work with or without amendment,

from the accounts of the *many* of whom he speaks, we cannot now ascertain, inasmuch as we do not possess those accounts. Just as little can we now determine the parts of the rest of which he was an eye-witness. As being present in the country which was the scene of the history, at the period when the events began to attract notice, he was in a situation to see much himself, and to devote to the whole the attention which was due to it; to test the accuracy of the declarations of common report, as well as of the insinuations of enemies; to separate the true from the false; and, while opinions were divided, to come to some certain conclusion. As a man of learning and cultivated mind, having turned his attention to these occurrences, he must have felt more inducement than others to keep some written account of them; and this probably gave him confidence, when circumstances seemed to require it, to undertake by means of a true history to make all unauthenticated statements superfluous, and to put an end to their circulation.

## JOHN .

## § 49.

Last of all, the disciple who lay in our Lord's bosom likewise presented his contemporaries with a memorial of his master. In regard to the origin and purpose of his book there are some declarations of the ancients yet extant; but there is so much dispute about them that they cannot be considered as principles for our guidance in interpretation. It is therefore necessary that we should examine the structure and plan of the work, in order to supply the deficiency of other undisputed evidence.

This Evangelist proceeds on a plan of his own, resembling Matthew so far as this, that he aims throughout the history to prove certain positions, making every thing tend to this object; but he differs from him in this respect, that he never loses the thread of the narrative or deviates from the real succession of events, and, with a very complicated and artificial plan, is notwithstanding careful to preserve historical order.

After a somewhat obscure introduction with which he opens his work, the first narrative which he presents to us contains the acknowledgment that Jesus was *Christ* or *Messiah*, by the Baptist (1: 19—34); and afterwards the same by Peter and Andrew (1: 41—44). Then follows the account of Philip's conviction that Jesus was he of whom *Moses* and the *Prophets* had written; and then of Nathaniel's, who declares him to be the *Son of God* and the *King of Israel* (1: 44—51).

When, after the first miracle at Cana, Jesus appeared in Jerusalem, he asserted that the temple was *his Father's house* (2: 16 seq.), and declared to Nicodemus that he was *the only begotten Son of God*, whom the Father's love had sent into the world for its salvation (3: 2—22). After his return from Jerusalem, John the Baptist declares anew that Jesus is *the Son of God sent from above, into whose hands the Father hath committed all power* (3: 23—36). Jesus is then on his way home through Samaria; a woman of that country perceives something

extraordinary in him, and our Lord avows himself to her as *the Messiah who is called Christ* (4: 25, 26); and many more believe that he is *the Christ, the Saviour of the world* (4: 42).

While in Jerusalem the second time, he heals the man who was waiting in vain at the pool of Bethesda. When the Jews blamed him for the miracle on account of the violation of the Sabbath, he asserted that his power was the power of God committed to him, that *God was his Father, he his Son*, his commissioned agent and judge of the world, of whom Moses spake (Chap. 5). After his return he wrought the miracle of the loaves, which caused the people to regard him as the *promised prophet*, and to wish to make him *king of Israel* (6: 14, 15). On the following day he asserts that he is the *bread of life, which came down from heaven* (6: 35 seq.), he who was with the *Father* and came from the *Father*; and Simon declares: *Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God* (6: 69).

On occasion of the feast of tabernacles, Jesus again visits Jerusalem, and openly rebukes the people for seeking his life. Some of the people declare him to be the Christ, and say that Christ himself could not do more miracles than he (7: 11—37). On the last day of the feast he is again regarded as *the Prophet and the Christ*, and a learned discussion arises with regard to this topic (7: 37—53).

If we proceed thus to consider in their order all the conversations and acts of Jesus which John has introduced into his book, we shall almost invariably find that their subject and purport are either that *Jesus is the Son of God*, or that *he is the Christ*, or both (8: 12—59. 9: 1—35 and 38. 10: 1—24. 10: 24—42. 11: 1—27. 12: 13—20. 12: 20—34. 12: 44, 45, 49). The promises and consolations in chapters 14—18, exhibit the relation between the Father and the Son, the divine origin of Jesus, his dignity as Messiah and as ruler and judge of the world. Even in the history of the passion he, as well as Matthew, aims to render the Messianic character of Jesus evident by comparison of the prophecies concerning him (19: 24, 28, 36, 37).

The whole structure of the book, therefore, and the judicious choice of all its component parts,<sup>1</sup> lead us to a conclusion in regard to the object of its author, the same as that which he clearly states at the close of his work, viz. that it was to prove *Jesus to be the Christ, the Son of God* (20: 31).

## § 50.

A dogmatic work of such extent, occupied about so few positions, must have been rendered necessary by the circumstances of the time; and we might conjecture that the aim of the writer in this fulness and accumulation of proof was probably polemical, or in other words apologetical.

This point, however, is placed beyond a doubt by John's first Epistle, which, as we shall see hereafter, was written with the same purpose, in the same circumstances, and at the same time, as the Gospel. At

<sup>1</sup> The same observation has been made and well pursued by Prof. Paulus. "Comment. Theol. Historiam Cerinthi ad finem Johanneorum in N. T. libellorum illustraturæ." Jenæ. 1795. 8vo. p. 157 seq.

that period certain persons apostatized from Christianity, of which they were probably never sincere professors (1 John 2: 19), who perverted the doctrines of Christianity (2: 18), broached false opinions, were *πεῦσται*, heretics and deceivers (2: 22. 4: 1, 2, 3), and denied that Jesus was the Christ and the Son of God (2: 22. 4: 1, 2, 3, 15, 16. 5: 5, 20). These men awakened in the breast of the Apostle anxiety for the preservation of pure doctrine and the peace of the Christian churches under his care, and gave occasion to his productions.

### § 51.

Still, however, those against whom John's Gospel was directed, are not yet brought definitely before us. According to ancient history there were many in the time of the Apostle, who maintained in different systems the position that *Jesus was not the Christ, the Son of God*; and this in those very churches to which he had devoted especial pains, and in whose midst he had resolved to dwell.

In this respect they were all dangerous, however they might differ on other points. The heresy was the same under various forms, and in his work the Apostle certainly had in his eye all the systems which were chargeable with this heresy, without according a flattering distinction to any particular one. We need not then inquire whether this book was directed against Cerinthus, when it is proved that he lived in these days and in this region, maintained this opinion, and moreover acquired celebrity as a teacher. It was directed against all who aimed by this tenet (with whatever theories or accessory ideas connected), to mislead the Christians for whose benefit John wrote.

It is not to be denied that according to the positive declarations of history, Cerinthus was a contemporary of the Apostle, and abode in the region in which the latter taught and labored in the cause of the Gospel; and that the heresy we have mentioned constituted a part of his system. At the same time, too, appeared the Nicolaitans, who caused much corruption in the churches and called for all the vigilance of the Apostle. In respect to this particular tenet, as well as many others, they coincided with Cerinthus.

Even had we no historical evidence as to this matter, if Irenæus, Jerome, and Epiphanius had not expressly mentioned Cerinthus and the Nicolaitans as heretics<sup>1</sup> whose influence John intended to counteract, still the authentic expression of his sentiments relative to certain heresies which is found in his first Epistle, compared with the plan and contents of the Gospel and the general history of the time, would direct us to these persons as certainly as definite historical information.

Stating the opinions of Cerinthus in conformity with the philosophy of those times, we have the following system. There is one God over all; he is most perfect unity, and could not therefore operate on matter and be the Creator of the world. From him emanated certain extreme-

<sup>1</sup> Iren. Adv. Hær. Lib. III. c. 9. "Hanc fidem annuntians Domini discipulus volens per Evangelii annuntiationem auferre eum, qui a Cerintho insemnatus est hominibus errorem, et multo prius ab his, qui dicuntur Nicolaitæ . . . sic inchoavit . . . In principio etc. Hieron. Script. Eccl. V. Joannis. Epiphan. Hær. LXIX.



ly pure and perfect natures (*invisibilia et innominabilia*), who augmented their number by propagation, and gradually decreased in spirituality, becoming more and more material, so as to retain but a slight connexion with the One, Eternal Being. These, from the increasing grossness of their nature, were able to operate upon matter and mould it into form.

A being of the latter order, one who knew nothing at all of the pure Eternal spirit, was the Creator of the world;<sup>1</sup> hence came evil and the imperfection of creation.—Such was the solution of a problem which has occasioned the most various theories on the part of the philosophers of these and former days.

As a philosopher, he found it difficult to admit that Jesus was born of a virgin, and maintained that he was begotten and born like the rest of mankind, according to the usual laws of nature; but that as a man he was superior to all his fellow-men in wisdom and mental greatness.

On the other hand, that he might in some way accord to Jesus the distinction of a higher origin, which his actions clearly evinced, he asserted that one of the spiritual natures we have mentioned, viz. the Christ, united himself to Jesus in the form of a dove at his baptism. On this account he possessed henceforth the power of producing superhuman effects, and likewise of acquainting mankind with the true eternal Deity, who had hitherto remained unknown to them because he had not revealed himself by any operation.

This Christ, as an immaterial being of exalted origin (*e superioribus Christus*), being one of the purer kinds of spirits, was from his nature not susceptible of material affections, of suffering and pain. He therefore at the commencement of the passion resumed his existence separately from Jesus, abandoned him to pain and death, and soared upwards to heaven from whence he came. Cerinthus distinguished Jesus and Christ, Jesus and the Son of God, as beings of different nature and dignity.<sup>2</sup>

The Nicolaitans held similar doctrines in regard to the Supreme Deity and his relation to mankind, and an inferior spirit who was the Creator of the world. Among the subaltern orders of spirits, they considered the most distinguished to be the only-begotten, the *μονογενής* (whose existence, however, had a beginning), and the *λόγος*, who

<sup>1</sup> Iren. L. III. c. 11. "Eam conditionem, quæ est secundum nos, non a primo Deo factam, sed a virtute aliquâ valde deorsum subjectâ, et abscissâ ab eorum communicatione, quæ sunt invisibilia et innominabilia." L. I. c. 26. "A virtute quâdam valde separatâ . . . et ignorante eum, qui est super omnia, Deum."

<sup>2</sup> The old reading of 1 John 4: 3, mentioned by Socrates (H. E. L. VII. c. 32), expresses this distinction very well. He testifies that it was read *ἐν τοῖς παλαιοῖς ἀντιγράφοις* thus: *πάν πνεῦμα ὃ λύει τὸν Ἰησοῦν (ἀπὸ τοῦ Χριστοῦ)* is to be understood) *ἐκ θεοῦ οὐκ ἐστὶ*. This reading, he further says, the old interpreters (*οἱ παλαιοὶ ἑρμηνεῖς*) even admitted to be the correct one. We find it in Irenæus still (L. III. c. 16. n. 8.), "Et omnis spiritus, qui solvit Jesum, non est ex Deo" as also in Tertullian and several writers who follow the old Latin version; but no Greek Mss. of the Catholic Epistles, which represent the text of that early period, now contain it. There is internal evidence, however, in favor of this reading; for it is the most obscure and difficult, and manifests profound thought, while the present reading: *πάν πνεῦμα ὃ μὴ ὁμολόγει τὸν Ἰησοῦν, ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ οὐκ ἐστὶ*, is suspicious from its being synonymous with the preceding clause.

was an immediate descendant of the only-begotten.<sup>1</sup> History is silent as to what other tenets they held in regard to these beings.

Christ belongs to the number of beings sprung from God; Jesus, however, is a son of the Creator of the world, with whom Christ united himself at his baptism, and whom he abandoned at his passion.<sup>2</sup>

### § 52.

At the commencement of his book the Evangelist gives great prominence to the assertion that Jesus is *the light* and *the life* (1: 4, 5, 9); and in the progress of his narrative, his attention is frequently, and according to his custom systematically, directed to these two positions, 3: 19—22. 5: 24, 35. 8: 12. 9: 5. 12: 35, 36 and 46. 6: 35 and 48. 6: 51—60. 10: 28. 9: 25, 26. 14: 6. 17: 3.

It would seem from his procedure in the selection of facts for his purpose, that the sacred writer had also in mind such persons as denied that Jesus was *the light* and *the life*, or, to speak without a figure, that he was the moral renovator and teacher of the world, to whom belonged the praise of having conducted them from their errors to the path of truth and happiness. There were several points which he was desirous of establishing; that Jesus was the Christ, that he was the Son of God, and that those who believed in him would have life through this discipleship (20: 31), *ὅτι ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἐστὶν ὁ Χριστὸς, ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ, καὶ ἵνα πιστεύοντες ζωὴν ἔχετε ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι αὐτοῦ.*

Nor is it difficult to conjecture the person to whom some gave precedence before our Lord as the enlightener of the world and author of the doctrines which conferred life on men. It was John the Baptist. When at the outset of his book the author announces the doctrine that

<sup>1</sup> For the benefit of those who see in the Logos nothing but Philo's doctrine and the Alexandrian philosophy, I refer them to Dr. Neander, who has clearly exhibited Philo's doctrine on this point, in such a manner as no other writer has. "Entwicklung der gnostischen Systeme." Berlin 1818. p. 1—28. "Elemente der Gnosis im Philo." This learned man evinces in many passages of his work his conviction, that the origin of these opinions lies farther back than Philo's time, and that an oriental *theosophy*, was shaped, in the Jewish and other nations, into various systems, which became known in the time of Christianity under the name of Gnostic systems.

<sup>2</sup> From some appearances, not so strongly marked, however, as to be perfectly decisive, we might be disposed to include likewise among those opposed by John's works such teachers as denied Christ a material body, attributing to him only an apparent one, and consequently making his passion only apparent, viz. the Docetæ, who denied: *Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν ἐν σαρκὶ ἐληλυθότα.* 1 Ep. 4: 2. 2 Ep. 7. We might likewise make the passage in the Gospel, 19: 34—38, in which John avers that blood and water really issued from his side, refer to this sect. These passages, however, are susceptible of a different interpretation. *Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν ἐν σαρκὶ ἐληλυθότα* or *ἐρχόμενον* may be understood as meaning that Jesus was not merely united with Christ at his baptism, but entered the world as Christ and was born as such. Storr "Ueber den Zweck der evangelisch. Geschichte Johannis und der Briefe," § 21. There exists, therefore, no necessity nor even probability of his referring to them. Had he intended to attack this sect, he would not have alluded to them so cursorily in but two passages, and those doubtful. The tenet enforced by the Gospel and the first Epistle is, that Jesus was the Christ, the son of God. The Docetæ were so far from denying this, that they even strenuously maintained that the *true* and *real*, contained or enveloped in the *apparent*, was the Christ, the Son of God.

*the Logos is the light which shineth in darkness*, he subjoins, *John came to bear witness of the light*. This is plain, and nothing more was necessary. But the writer feels a deep-rooted anxiety in regard to this point, and expressly repeats this declaration a second time in an antithesis, and the first member of this antithesis again for the third time: "*The same came for a witness, to bear witness of the light, that all men through him might believe. He was not that light, but was sent to bear witness of that light. That was the true light which lighteth every man that cometh into the world.*" (John 1: 7, 8, 9).

The Evangelist has also selected discourses of Jesus which contain declarations of his superiority to John, and he introduces confessions of John himself, which state the pre-existence of Jesus, his unequalled dignity as teacher and as the author of life and happiness to man, and his own inferiority, as being but a disciple and messenger (1: 15. 1: 20—31. 3: 26—36. 5: 34—37. 10: 41).

We find, too, that in this region and in Ephesus, the city which the Evangelist had selected for his residence, there were men in Nero's time who did not know of any other baptism than John's, had become his disciples through it, and had heard nothing of the Holy Ghost; for Paul afterwards laid his hands on certain men of this description, and baptized them in the name of the Lord Jesus, imparting to them the Holy Ghost, so that they spoke with tongues (Acts 19: 1—8). They were certainly not the only such persons of their time; and many may have been more pertinacious in their preference for their teacher, and less flexible in their opinions.

To such, probably, the Evangelist had reference in introducing those passages which exhibit John as not daring to compare his baptism, viz. the baptism by water, with the baptism with water and with the Holy Ghost (1: 33. 3: 26—39). So likewise the observation in relation to the gifts of the Spirit (7: 39), which contains an explanation for those who were not, rather than those who were, believers: the exalted representation of regeneration by water and the Spirit (3: 3—12); and all that Jesus says respecting the Comforter and the Holy Ghost, which was to be poured out on his disciples after he was ascended to heaven (14: 16, 17. 14: 26. 15: 26. 16: 7—15).

### § 53.

The procedure of the Evangelist in carrying his plan into execution is remarkably singular, and a problem which we are bound to solve. There is much considerateness and deliberate system apparent, even in *minutiæ*, in respect to the arrangement of the book and the choice of facts for a particular purpose; and yet the author has totally neglected the most valid proofs of his positions. This was not by any means because circumstances denied him an intimate acquaintance with them; for the occurrences alluded to were such as he must have been well acquainted with, on account of his presence and participation, and such as must have been fastened forever in the minds of all who witnessed them, on account of their grand, supernatural, and astonishing character.

Could he have passed over such important facts, if they had not al-

ready been detailed by other credible writers? Could he have given up with indifference the best aids to his design, had not other historians preceded him in regard to them?

In the synagogue at Capernaum there was a demoniac who knew Jesus and cried out to him, "*Thou art the Holy One of God*," etc. John was there at the time, for when Jesus left the synagogue he was in his company with James and Andrew (Mark 1: 29); and this miracle was one of the first which he saw his Master perform.

At Gadaris a multitude of demons acknowledge Jesus to be *the Son of the Most High God* (Matth. 8: 29. Mark 5: 7. Luke 8: 28). John was present, for on the return we find him in our Lord's company (Mark 5: 37. Luke 8: 51).

Among the many evidences which he adduces in support of the dignity of Jesus as Messiah and Son of God, this species likewise merited attention. The testimony of the spiritual world was to many, on account of their notions, a more weighty argument than any other; and the more unexceptionable, as it was the testimony of hostile powers, who were unable to deny our Lord this dignity.

He is wholly silent as to what took place before Caiaphas in regard to Jesus, and only relates Peter's adventures in the high priest's palace. Yet he evinces remarkable familiarity with the minutest circumstances throughout the history of the passion, surpassing all the other Evangelists, in this respect. He informs us that Jesus was not led immediately to Caiaphas, but first to Annas, and states the reason of this; and then goes on to detail, with much more precision than the other Evangelists, what happened with regard to Peter. Thus, with all his historical knowledge, he neglected what was of great consequence to his chief object, and devoted his attention to a matter of little moment. We learn from the other Evangelists, that Jesus was examined before Caiaphas, that his declarations were taken down, witnesses were heard, and the accusation which was to be made against him before the Prætor definitely settled; and that on this occasion (a circumstance of very great importance with reference to John's design) Jesus declared before the council, after calling the living God, the Most High, to witness, and the declaration was recorded, that he was the Son of God and the Messiah, *that he was to take his place henceforth at the right hand of God, and was to come in the clouds of heaven* (Matth. 26: 64. Mark 14: 62. Luke 22: 69).

The transfiguration on the mount, of which John was a spectator with others, was evidently the highest proof of the positions of his book, infinitely superior to all the alleged confessions of pious men, the disciples of Jesus, or the convictions of all others, Jews or Gentiles. On this occasion alone, with the exception of his baptism, was Jesus *acknowledged by God himself in a voice from heaven as his beloved Son, in whom he was well pleased* (Matth. 17: 1. Mark 9: 2. Luke 9: 27 seq.)

Directly after this occurrence, too, the object of the ministry of John the Baptist, his relation to Jesus, and the inferiority of his authority and office to those of Jesus, which constituted one of the subjects to be elucidated in John's Gospel, were clearly and accurately stated by Jesus (Matth. 17: 10 seq. Mark 9: 12). The whole is entirely unnoticed by John.



Even the only event which can bear any comparison with this in argumentative force in regard to the points he wished to establish, viz. the history of Jesus' baptism, is likewise totally omitted by him; he merely introduces the Baptist as saying something which has a reference to it, but which would be itself unintelligible, if we did not know the story of his baptism from the works of the other Evangelists. The Baptist is introduced as follows (1: 32, 33, 34): "John bare record, saying, I saw the Spirit descending from heaven like a dove, and it abode upon him. And I knew him not; but he that sent me to baptize with water, the same said unto me, Upon whom thou shalt see the Spirit descending and remaining on him, the same is he which baptizeth with the Holy Ghost. And I saw, and bare record that this is the Son of God." We do not learn from this even when and how the Spirit descended upon Jesus; but have only the declaration of the Baptist that he was an eye-witness of the occurrence, and henceforth regarded Jesus as the Son of God. That this happened, however, at his baptism, that when Jesus was coming up out of the water, the Spirit descended on him like a dove, that the heavens were opened, and a voice came from them saying: *This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased*—all this we do not find in our Evangelist, nor should we even be able to understand to what the language of John the Baptist had reference, did we not possess from another quarter the information which is presupposed by the Evangelist.

It needs no erudition to perceive, that throughout his whole book John has presented no argument in support of his positions, which can compare at all as to validity and authority with these which he has neglected. Now did he leave unnoticed these forcible facts, with which circumstances made him better acquainted than either of the Evangelists, in the hope that in time there would appear historians who would record them, and bring forward what would have been his best arguments? or is it certain that he would not and could not have omitted them, had not others already made use of these materials, which would have been so much to his purpose, so that he could not use them without going over beaten ground? If the first conclusion be, as it is, absurd, we must adopt the second. There remained, therefore, for the Apostle, to be employed for his purposes, only what had been omitted by previous writers. These omitted portions of the history were all which he could treat of, even though they might not be by any means so important as those which had been already presented. He was thus, not only able, but compelled, to proceed as he has done, in the execution of his plan.

It is only on this supposition that we can explain his procedure in regard to two important subjects, viz. doctrines and miracles. It might have been thought that, in order to exhibit Jesus to the polished Asiatics in a point of view in which they were peculiarly disposed to consider him, John would have selected for his theme his elevated moral wisdom, and have undertaken to show that the world had never seen anything like it. But he felt stronger claims on his attention from another quarter; he felt it specially incumbent upon him to establish the divine authority and truth of these as well as other doctrines, viz. that Jesus was not merely a man, instructed perhaps by some being of a higher order, who revealed to him the doctrines which he taught; but that he

had the highest legislative power, was with God *πρὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου*, before the corner-stone of creation was laid; that he was one with God, the partner of his wisdom and power, the Son of God, or, which is the same thing, the Messiah, *ὁ Χριστός*; that he came immediately from heaven, and after accomplishing his work of reforming man, ascended again to the possession of his hereditary glory. To prove these points he appeals to the declarations of Jesus himself, which he presents in abundance and minutely. In proceeding thus, he was well aware that the moral doctrines of Jesus had been stated with sufficient fulness and distinctness by others; and that all which remained was to show the sacred character of these and other doctrines, and their immediate divine origin.

Now in what way has he established the truth of the declarations of Jesus? By *miracles*. Throughout the book, whenever our Lord declares his divine origin, his dignity as the only begotten Son of God, he attests the truth of his declarations by the miracles which he performed. Those who receive his assertions and maintain their truth, do it on the ground of these signs and wonders of divine power, 2: 23. 3: 2. *σημεῖα*, 4: 48. *σημεῖα καὶ τέρατα*, 5: 19—21. 5: 36. 6: 2, 14, 26. 7: 3—31. 9: 3, 4. *ἔργα τοῦ θεοῦ*, 9: 16. *σημεῖα*, 9: 31—34. 10: 21—25, 37, 38, 41. 11: 42, 45, 47. *πολλὰ σημεῖα*, 12: 18. 12: 37—43. 14: 10—13. 15: 24. Thus the argument always rests on miracles;<sup>1</sup> yet John has mentioned very few of them, and detailed only five. How could he have proceeded thus, if he did not know that these miracles had been before attested by well-known writings? that the proof on which every thing ultimately depended, had already been adduced?

As respects the narrative of the Lord's supper, too, he evidently takes for granted the existence of other authentic histories. It was specially requisite that this occurrence, containing as it did an example for future commemorations of our Lord's death throughout the Christian world, should be preserved in writing; and who was better fitted to depict it than the disciple who during the supper lay on Jesus' bosom? He, however, says only just so much concerning it in his book as to show that he designedly passed over the narrative, because it needed no mention; and he proceeds to relate instead certain incidental occurrences, which are found nowhere else. "Now before the feast of the passover," says he, "when Jesus knew that his hour was come, that he should depart out of this world unto the Father, having loved his own which were in the world, he loved them unto the end. *And supper being ended, καὶ δεῖπνον γενομένου*, he rose and girded himself, and poured water into a basin," etc. After washing his disciples' feet he returned to the table, *πάλιν ἀναπεσών*. There is not a word throughout respecting the con-

<sup>1</sup> We may hence judge whether the reason why John omitted most of the miracles was, that they had nothing to do with his idea of a Messiah, and were little in accordance with Hellenic taste. How inconceivable, in that case, that he should make everything depend ultimately on miracles! The Messiah, therefore, whom he exhibits in his Gospel, is the ancient Jewish Messiah and Son of God, whose character was attested by miracles, and not a Hellenized Messiah, more refined than the Jewish one, and presented in a purely metaphysical light in order to favor the speculative disposition of the inhabitants of Asia Minor; from which latter point of view, however, it has been attempted to determine the end and aim of the Gospel. It was rather his endeavor to set bounds to the unlimited speculation of the Asiatics.

secration of the bread and wine; the treachery of Judas, only, is alluded to (13: 1—23). Was it possible to exhibit more clearly a settled design to omit this occurrence, considering its affecting and important character? Was it possible more plainly to take for granted that it was attested already, and secured from forgetfulness and from the accidents of time?

Now all this, the previous historical existence of which is taken for granted in his plan of procedure, we find in our Gospels; and by their aid alone could we discover the peculiar principles by which he was guided, and perceive what had to his knowledge been already related. These Gospels were certainly before him.

Certain allusions which he has made to narratives previously in existence accord in a striking manner with our Evangelists. According to John's history, after Jesus had chosen his first disciples and made a commencement of his miracles at Cana, he went from Nazareth to Capernaum, where he designed to dwell. Soon after, a passover occurred, on which occasion our Lord travelled for the first time in his new capacity to Jerusalem (2: 13). As he journeyed homeward from this city after the feast, through Judea, he baptized. John was sojourning at the time for the same purpose at Ænon, near Salim, whither a great multitude of persons desirous of being baptized, and of disciples, came to him (3: 22 seq.). After relating these things concerning the Baptist, he subjoins: *for John was not yet cast into prison, οὐπω γὰρ ἦν βεβλημένος εἰς τὴν φυλακὴν.*

This addition is not an explanation of his own narrative, for the whole tenor of his history shows that John was yet at liberty. It was therefore inserted as a correction of some other accounts which he intended to charge with inaccuracy.

Now this correction is really applicable to two of our Gospels. Matthew who neglected chronology, says directly after the temptation, before Jesus is related to have gone to Capernaum, that John had been cast into prison (4: 12). Mark retained the same statement (1: 14), because his voucher, Peter, did not alter it. Luke alone avoided the anachronism (4: 14). To whom, then, must the Evangelist have referred in the observation: *for John was not yet cast into prison?*

Again, his procedure in regard to the woman that was a sinner, who anointed Jesus, is remarkable in the same point of view. He speaks (11: 1 seq.) of Bethany, the dwelling-place of *Mary* and *Martha*, whose brother lay sick. He here breaks off his narrative, and at the word *Mary* inserts the parenthetic remark: *This was that Mary who anointed the Lord with ointment, and wiped his feet with her hair.*

He himself has not yet related this story of the woman that anointed Jesus, and does not give it till afterwards, where he designates who she was more expressly than the other Evangelists (12: 1). By this mode of narration he assumes the fact as already known before he has himself related it. He, however, judges it necessary to inform the reader of the name of the person, supposing him to be ignorant of it.

The story is related in the other Gospels, and the assumption that it was already known seems to denote that they were in existence when John wrote. Neither of them, however, has designated the person either by name or by attendant circumstances; so that the observation is entirely pertinent to their narrative, and we can see to what it had reference.

But this is not all; still more distinct traces of the three previous Gospels are perceptible. Mark has added something to the account of this occurrence as it stands in Matthew, but in such a manner that its identity is perfectly clear; while Luke has omitted the circumstances contained in the two former Evangelists, and detailed others connected with the occurrence. Hence we might be led to consider the event which he relates as an entirely different one from that related by Matthew and Luke; especially as Luke has assigned it to a different period. Matthew and Mark state that the woman anointed the head of Jesus; Luke that it was his feet, and that she wiped them with the hair of her head. The former state the dissatisfaction of Judas respecting it, while Luke mentions the reproach of the Pharisee, and the rebuke which he received (7: 39). John combines the circumstances related in all the three into one narrative. The description of the ointment and of its value he borrows from Mark; the procedure of the woman, from Luke; and the admonition which Jesus gave to Judas, from Matthew (Matth. 26: 7. Mark 14: 3. Luke 7: 37. John 12: 3).

Matthew.	Mark.	Luke.	John.
	ἔχουσα ἀλάβαστρον μύρου, νάρδου πισ- τικῆς πολυτελοῦς·	ἤρξατο βρέχειν τοὺς πόδας, καὶ ἤλειψε, καὶ ταῖς θριξὶ τῆς κεφαλῆς αὐτῆς ἐξέμασσε, καὶ κατεφίλει τοὺς πόδας αὐτοῦ.	Ἡ οὖν Μαρία λαβοῦσα λίτραν μύρου νάρδου πισ- τικῆς πολυτίμου, ἤλειψε τοὺς πόδας τοῦ Ἰησοῦ, καὶ ἐξέμαξε
	Ἡ δὲ δύνατο τοῦτο τὸ μύρον		ταῖς θριξίν αὐτῆς τοὺς πόδας αὐτοῦ· . . . . Λέγει οὖν κ. τ. λ. Διὰ τοῦτο τὸ μύρον οὐκ ἐπράθη τριακοσίων δηναρίων, καὶ ἐδόθη πτωχοῖς· . . . Εἶπεν οὖν ὁ Ἰησοῦς·
	προθῆναι ἐπάνω τριακοσίων δηναρίων, καὶ δοθῆναι τοῖς πτωχοῖς. Ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν·		Ἄφες αὐτήν· εἰς τὴν ἡμέραν
	Ἄφες αὐτήν· προέλαβε μυρίσαι μου τὸ σῶμα εἰς τὸν ἐνταφιασ- μόν.		τοῦ ἐνταφιασμοῦ μου τετήρηκεν αὐτό. Τοὺς πτωχοὺς γὰρ πάντοτε ἔχετε μεθ' ἑαυτῶν, ἐμὲ δὲ οὐ πάντοτε ἔχετε.
Πάντοτε γὰρ τοὺς πτωχοὺς ἔχετε μεθ' ἑαυτῶν· ἐμὲ δὲ οὐ πάντοτε ἔχετε.			



## § 54.

Supposing these writers to have been acquainted with each other's works, and each therefore to have made use of the work of his predecessor, resting all his own merit upon an improvement of the narrative, there is weight in the following argument for the priority of Luke to John, and much more for his priority to Matthew and Mark, on whose works that of Luke was based.

John has given to some narratives a completeness that Matthew's sketches, and even Mark's amplification of them, which was copied by Luke, did not possess; and which they did not obtain until they came under the hand of so acute an observer as this apostle, who was generally foremost among the disciples.

Matthew describes in 26: 69—75, the denial of Peter, paying attention to the fact alone, and not to the place or persons that occasioned it. Mark treads in his foot-steps, adding almost nothing (14: 66—72); as likewise Luke, who in a great measure copies his predecessors (22: 54—63).

On the other hand, John states definitely the place of the transaction. It commenced in the palace of the high priest Annas; there, in the court, into which John had procured him admission, Peter denied our Lord for the first time to the woman who kept the door (18: 17). John then changes the scene to the presence of Caiaphas, where the other three Evangelists first take up the narrative, and begin the story of Peter's denial of his Master; while according to John he only finished in this place what he began in the house of Annas, and for the second and third time disowned acquaintance with Jesus (18: 25—27).

We may observe, too, that according to Matthew it was another of the maids, ἄλλη, according to Mark, ἡ παιδίσκη, and according to Luke, ἄλλος, a man, who led Peter to deny the second time; while according to John it was several persons at once, εἶπον οὖν αὐτῷ, the accounts of all the Evangelists being thus reconciled.

It is evident that in this case, particularly in respect to the designation of the scene of the first occurrence, John has imparted additional completeness to the narrative; and Luke could not have contented himself with the imperfect account of the first two writers, and have transferred it just as it was into his book, had the work of the beloved disciple been before him.

In the account of the resurrection, Matthew, as usual, is careless about the order in which the occurrences succeeded each other, as it had nothing to do with his object; and he merely keeps in view his main design. At dawn of day, he says, when the women visited the sepulchre, an angel rolled away the stone, and announced to them that the Lord had risen, and that they must go and tell his disciples; and they made haste to obey (28: 1—11). Mark and Luke left this just as they found it in Matthew (Mark 16: 1—9. Luke 24: 1—10).

John, who went thither himself, and was in the garden and at the sepulchre, gives us more precise information as to the time of this occurrence. Mary Magdalene had already been at the sepulchre, where she found the stone rolled away, and then called thither two of the dis-

ciples, Peter and John. While the latter were occupied in examining for themselves, she stood without weeping; she then stepped again into the sepulchre, and now saw the men in white raiment, and afterwards our Lord himself.

Luke, therefore, might have derived essential aid from the more complete narrative of John, and must certainly have copied that rather than the narratives of Matthew and Mark, had he been so fortunate as to see, before the publication of his own work, that of a writer of such high authority on account of his peculiar circumstances.

### § 55.

Such are the internal evidences in the books of Matthew, Mark and Luke, that they were antecedent to the Gospel of John; and such the references in the latter which show that the writer was acquainted with the contents of the three other Gospels. Now if the declarations of ancient writers coincide with this conclusion, they do not deserve to be so summarily rejected as they have been.

John, says Eusebius,<sup>1</sup> for a long time occupied himself with oral instruction alone. When Matthew, Mark, and Luke, had published their Gospels, they came under his eye; he gave them his approval and his testimony to their truth, and determined to supply what was wanting in them by a work of his own. It is true that what Eusebius says respecting that part of the history omitted, which it was John's intention to supply, is not correct; but it is clear from his own representation that he connected his exegetical notions with the ancient account, and these must be distinguished from the latter.

We obtain the same account in substance, though accompanied with other embellishments, from a Latin father, who lived perhaps at the commencement of the third century.<sup>2</sup> The fourth Gospel, says he, is by John, one of the disciples, who, when his fellow-disciples and the elders of the church solicited him to write it, replied, Fast with me. It was then revealed in the night to Andrew, one of the apostles, that John should review the other books, or consult the other apostles (the text is uncertain, and was probably ambiguous in the Greek itself: *ἀνεξετάζομενον πάντων, πάντα συγγράψουτο*), and present the result in a work under his own name. The fabulous part of this account does not hinder us from admitting its main purport; and moreover this very fabulous statement assures us that the same fact is here attested on totally different authority from the former.

The account of a writer who is perhaps somewhat later than the preceding, but who appeals to earlier fathers, is destitute of such embellishments and approaches nearer its original purity. Clement of Alexandria states,<sup>3</sup> that when John, the last of the Evangelists, perceived that what related to our Lord as a man had been fully treated of in the Gospels, he, at the instance of his friends, composed under divine inspiration a Gospel which unfolded his spiritual nature.

<sup>1</sup> Euseb. H. E. L. III. c. 24.

<sup>2</sup> Antiqq. Ital. Med. Æv. Muratorii. T. III. p. 854.

<sup>3</sup> Euseb. H. E. L. IV. c. 14.

And what is more natural, than that John, who outlived all his companions, and who, if his Epistles were connected with his Gospel, wrote his history in his old age, as a *πρεσβύτερος*, should have seen, and been familiar with, the Gospels which were already in circulation?

### § 56.

John, therefore, saw the other Gospels; and this was one of the circumstances which determined the plan and nature of his own work and the selection of the facts to be introduced in it.

The scene of events with the first three Evangelists is Galilee; and among its cities Capernaum in particular. There our Lord first appears after leaving his abode at Nazareth to commence his ministry. From this place he makes his journeys; and thither he returns after going to Gennesareth, to Gadaris, or the region of Tyre and Sidon, or teaching and performing miracles in Decapolis. Within this circuit all the actions of Jesus related by them are comprehended; and Jesus never steps out of it till he goes to suffer at Jerusalem.

The case is different with John. He presents to us new scenes in other regions. He leads us to Judea, and particularly to Jerusalem. In regard to events which took place there he is extremely copious; but takes scarcely any notice of what occurred in Galilee. Even when the first three Evangelists conduct Jesus to the borders of Judea, they there lose sight of him, and John takes up the narrative and accompanies him in his course. He, however, does not follow him back into Galilee, but forsakes him on the borders of that country, which was the historical province of the other Evangelists.

In the whole of John's work, from the beginning of Christ's ministry to the end, there is but one discourse which was uttered in Galilee (6: 22. 7: 1); and, the days of the passion excepted, there are but three facts which he has in common with the other Evangelists. Two of them are the feeding of the five thousand, and the voyage on the sea connected with it, in which Jesus appears to the disciples in the storm for their deliverance (6: 1—22). These he has repeated, because they were indispensable as introductory to the discourses above mentioned, which immediately follow. There is, besides, the fact of the anointing of Jesus by Mary (John 12: 3), which is repeated for the reasons given in the 53d §.

Thus the first three Evangelists occupy themselves with occurrences in Galilee, and John with those in Judea and its capital. In this way we obtain a complete account of the last three years of Jesus' life.

### § 57.

We may hence explain the assertion that in John's Gospel *the representation of Christ is very different from that contained in the other Gospels*. He is the same yesterday, to-day, and forever, as Paul says; it is only his situation which is different. While travelling in retired parts of Galilee or on the shore of Gennesareth, whither he was followed by curious multitudes who were readily susceptible of good impressions, he merely discourses respecting moral virtues and piety, declares his

purpose only in parables, leaves the multitude to conjecture his commission, and obtains from a few individuals the confession that he is the Christ, the Son of God (Matth. 8: 29. Mark 5: 7. Luke 8: 28. Matth. 14: 33. 16: 16. Mark 8: 29. Luke 10: 20. Mark 1: 24. Luke 4: 34. Mark 3: 11. Luke 4: 41). He heals unfortunate wretches by miraculous power, and in doing so seeks to attract as little attention as possible, that he may not excite any ferment in the minds of the people, which might place him in a false light. A single tumultuous assemblage might have defeated all his purposes, and have subjected him to the death of a malefactor.

His situation in Judea was very widely different. There he had no cause for any apprehension of the kind. The Jews were not favorable towards him; least of all at Jerusalem. Then, too, he had nowhere so much reason to unfold his commission and purposes, to explain what he intended to effect and the authority on which he rested his enterprise, as in the metropolis. In remote and thinly peopled districts, in discourses in the country, it was of little importance; the only proper place for such a disclosure was the central point of Judaism, the scene of festival assemblies in which innumerable multitudes were gathered together, the seat of religious authority and sacred learning. It was necessary that he should proclaim his secret here; for from this place alone could it go forth into the world. Hence, what in Galilee he only permitted the people to conjecture, he himself declares openly in Jerusalem, and proclaims himself at the feasts as one sent from God, as the Son who was with the Father before the world was, as the Messiah and the author of a new dispensation; and this so long and so loudly that his claims and the acknowledgement of them on the part of the people, eventually impelled the priests and others belonging to the class of learned men to effect his execution by calling to their aid the Roman authority.

He was thus assured that he was not to disappear like a phenomenon only partially seen and understood, nor even to meet an unheeded death in a remote district; but, that he was to be condemned to suffer and expire in the far-famed city of Jerusalem, in the sight of innumerable witnesses from Asia and other quarters of the world, and that he would be commiserated and revered by them as a sacrifice to lofty purposes.

Such a public exposition of his high origin and destination was given by Jesus but once out of Judea, viz. at Capernaum, the place which he had selected as the point to extend information respecting himself and his doctrines through Galilee and the region round about (John 6: 26—64).

When, however, he appears in the country in John's Gospel, his procedure is the same as represented by the other Evangelists. Observe the manner in which he instructs the woman of Samaria in a skilfully conducted conversation: his religion was confined to no people and no place; it was henceforth to extend itself to all the inhabitants of the earth, enlightening the soul, and diffusing true ideas of God (John 4: 4—31). We may infer from this example how little occasion there would have been for the idea that Christ is not the same in all the Evangelists, had



John related those things which occurred in the country, rather than those which took place in the metropolis.

Jesus' custom of connecting some moral lesson with the occurrences of the moment, of linking some instructive saying with an object presented by the occasion; his mode of clothing doctrines in figures, and of deriving tropes and allegorical ornament from things which were immediately before his eyes, are so impossible to be mistaken in this story of his interview with the woman of Samaria, that we in vain seek to discern in it another Messiah; its contents are not to be thus perverted. What our Lord says is linked, after the manner of Socrates, with the nearest objects; with the water, a favorite image of doctrine in the east; with the food which is brought to him, from which he draws a figurative expression to denote that his mind was occupied then about higher matters; with the fields of corn, whose situation immediately under his eye suggested the figure he employs. On approaching Naplousa, the narrow valley widens into a plain about two miles in length, which presents a rich prospect of blooming and fertile fields,<sup>1</sup> well suited to suggest to Jesus the figure respecting the blissful result which he hoped would ensue from the inculcation of his doctrines. The Samaritan woman could not comprehend his words. This was very natural from her circumstances; she could suppose anything rather than that a Jew should instruct her in an affable manner. She regarded him as a prophet, because he knew her most secret affairs. Is this so very wrong and absurd? The woman judged precisely like many others. In the opinion of the Syrians, the prophet Elisha knew the most secret intentions of the king of Syria (2 Kings 6: 12). Daniel knew what Nebuchadnezzar had dreamed and had himself forgotten. The Jews required of Bar-Cocba, when he claimed to be the Messiah, that he should divine the thoughts of men by his sense of smell without seeing them,<sup>2</sup> מריח נדאין.

Not to mention such language in Luke as recurs in John almost literally (17: 3. 13: 3. 3: 5 and John 8: 56), we have in Luke 10: 21—25 (comp. Matth. 11: 25—27), an example of the general style of Jesus' language to his disciples on solemn occasions; and this same spirit and tone I recognize in John's account of the leave which Jesus took of his disciples. The occasion was only more solemn; a great event, the abrupt termination of his career, was at hand.

Judas Iscariot had left the company to commit his traitorous act (13: 31). Now, said Jesus, is the Son of man glorified; I am but a little while with you; I leave you the commandment of love which I have exemplified. He then exhorts his disciples not to despond at his death. He is going to his Father to prepare a place for them; the protection of the Father will follow them here below; moreover, the Father will send them the Spirit which shall reveal all things to them. He now utters his farewell to his disciples; but says that he will come again; then bids them rise, and go hence (14: 31), *ἔγείρεσθε, ἄγωμεν ἐντεῦθεν*.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Maundrell, Monconys.

<sup>2</sup> Gemar. Hierosolym. Tr. Sanhedr. c. XI.

<sup>3</sup> Some have supposed these words to be a gloss, without any reason, and in opposition to the evidence of all the Mss. and versions now extant.

While they were seated, the discourse maintained the tender form of conversation ; but after having risen, he proceeds, while standing, to exhort them to united and persevering efforts in concurrence with his purposes, and with increased earnestness he admonishes them to love each other and himself, and to expect and endure with a resigned temper a cruel lot ; again promises them the Spirit ; begins to mention more frequently his approaching death ; and silence reigns among the disciples. No one presumes to speak. Once only they question among themselves what is the meaning of the words : " A little while and ye shall not see me, and again a little while and ye shall see me ? " He perceives this, and explains himself ; they believe that they now understand him (16: 33).

The occasion becomes more solemn ; the discourse takes a higher tone ; Jesus stands at the goal of his career. At this moment his conscience bears him witness that he has accomplished the commission given him by the Father to bring truth into the world. He, moreover, with deep emotion commends his disciples to his Father's protection ; and not only they, but all who should believe in him (Chap. 18). Every thought and feeling bears marks of belonging to that eventful hour.

And is not all this in accordance with the character of Christ ? Is it not the farewell of an exalted and noble soul, which, untroubled by the thought of impending suffering, occupies itself wholly with its lofty schemes and with the business of instructing and consoling those whom it leaves behind ! And I must further ask, could the gradation in the conversation possibly be more natural ? Can there be imagined a more beautiful rise than is here presented ; first mutual remark, then increasing silence among the listeners, broken only by a low question, till ultimately the last whisper dies away, and in the universal stillness the soul mounts upward to its loftiest elevation !

Were this discourse clothed in the elegant language of a Plato or a Xenophon, with what admiration should we read it ! But the writer was unable to impart such a recommendation to his narrative ; imperfection in the art of composition is plainly visible.

### § 58.

We must not content ourselves with the observations we have just made, inasmuch as there have recently appeared other harsh charges against this Gospel which we ought not to neglect to scrutinize.<sup>1</sup> The first allegation we have heard. But, in order to destroy all confidence in this writer, it is attempted to prove that he was not an eye-witness of the facts he relates, and therefore we cannot be sure of their accuracy. Let us then take a closer survey of the contents of his book. A part of it relates to what befell our Lord in the capital ; a part to his discourses ; and a part to his acts. We will subjoin a few observations on certain particulars worthy of notice.

1. That our Lord should have visited Jerusalem but once during his ministry, viz. at the time of his death, is incredible, considering the institutions of his nation, which were respected by him, and the notoriety

<sup>1</sup> C. Th. Bretschneider, *Probabilia de Evangelii et Epistolarum Joannis Ap. indole et origine*. Lips. 1820.

which it was essential that he should gain. It is plain, too, from Luke, that he visited Jerusalem several times; and thus, at the outset, the general tenor of John's work is sustained.

If we examine particularly what is stated to *have befallen* Jesus in Jerusalem, we can perceive the gradual progress of things to the final result, his death. At his first appearance in the city he gained many adherents, but found cause for distrust (2: 23, 24). The second time of his coming certain zealots openly opposed him (5: 16, 18), and in their malice plotted against his life (8: 1). Their design, being noised abroad, was notorious among the people when he appeared in their midst the third time (7: 25). Still their wish to lay hands on him was stronger than their resolution (7: 30). When the Pharisees and chief priests heard what was the popular feeling in regard to him (7: 32), they sent public officers to take him prisoner; but these likewise wanted courage to execute the order; he was befriended, too, by his secret adherents (7: 44—52). The wish to get possession of his person continued, but was not carried into effect (8: 20). The zealots on this account entertained increased hope, particularly at the last feast but one which he attended, of finding a good opportunity to stone him (8: 59. 10: 31, 32, 33. 11: 8). But Jesus withdrew himself from danger, so long as the mode or time of the death meditated for him was not that which was appointed. The chief priests vacillated a long time, until, when the third passover was nigh at hand, the Sanhedrim, incensed by recent occurrences, declared his death to be necessary, and consulted together as to the measures to be taken for effecting it (11: 49—53). The council soon after issued an injunction that whoever knew where Jesus was should give information (11: 57); and at last one of his disciples offered to point out his nightly resort.

This representation does away all that is sudden and accidental in the death of Jesus; and we have instead a regular chain of circumstances, which are undeniably in accordance with probability. The ultimate event, which stands isolated in the other Gospels, appears no longer a surprising thing, occasioned by a single and brief visit on the part of Jesus (his last one) to Jerusalem.

2. Many of the *discourses* of Jesus were interrupted by objections on the part of one or more of the multitude about him; and hence they rather follow the lead of these objections than their own natural train. Our Lord, however, generally endeavored to return to the point of departure; and hence necessarily arose repetitions, which would not have taken place had his discourse proceeded undisturbed. In the discourse contained in 7: 14—36, he was three times interrupted by cavils, and once by an attempt to take him prisoner (v. 15, 20, 27—33, 35); in the one in 8: 12—59, such cavils were advanced no less than ten different times (v. 13, 19, 22, 25, 33, 39, 41, 48, 52, 57). Now who but one who had himself heard these various cavils, and the turns and circumlocutions of the discourse, could know all these particulars? Evidently, he who records them, whoever he was, was himself one of the listeners, or else wrote from the dictation of one who was a listener. He would have been remarkably fortunate at a later period to procure the most general outlines of these occurrences through a third or fourth hand.

He even knew the circumstances of the confidential intercourse of our Lord with his disciples at the time of his taking leave of them (13: 36—chap. 15); the question put by Peter, the apprehension expressed by Thomas, the request of Philip, and the doubt of Judas, not Iscariot (13: 36. 14: 5, 8, 22). A similar case occurs earlier (12: 20, 23). Just so on another occasion, while the rest of the Evangelists content themselves with a general account (Matth. 14: 15, 18. Mark 6: 35, 38. Luke 9: 12, 13), he remembers what our Lord said to Philip, the reply of the latter, and the remark then made by Andrew (John 6: 5—10).

We must not forget to mention here the references to time and place, such as are presented at the beginning of the discourse which was ten times interrupted, and also in the one immediately preceding. Both were uttered on the great day of the feast of tabernacles. They are separated by an intervening occurrence, viz. the decision respecting the adulteress, which constitutes one of the most difficult as well as most beautiful passages in this Gospel.<sup>1</sup> An illumination in the temple, which cast a bright light in the western part of the city on the fronts of the houses where the booths were erected, and the custom of drawing water, with which the people amused themselves and which they hoped would induce God to bless them with abundant rains, graced the festivity of the feast of tabernacles.<sup>2</sup> This custom of drawing water was alluded to in the exclamation, "If any man thirst let him come unto me and drink" (7: 37). The hymns which were sung in the temple during the feast were certainly not without allusions to the blessing of the approaching season of rain; and probably suggested to Jesus the inspired passage which he adduced in confirmation of his promise to confer blessings on those who should come to him (7: 38). The following words of the Talmud deserve notice: The place is called the house for drawing water; but there they drew the Holy Spirit.<sup>3</sup> The illumination suggested to Jesus the figure in 8: 12, where he calls upon men to follow him that they may have the light of life. It is true, as has been objected, that there was probably no illumination on that very day, the last day of the feast; but the enormous candlesticks, by which the illumination was produced, were before his eyes, and reminded those present of the light they had diffused. For these candlesticks were set up in the court of the women<sup>4</sup> which was adjoining to the *γαζοφυλάκιον*,<sup>5</sup>

<sup>1</sup> I have presented my exposition of this narrative in the following treatise: *De conjugii Christiani vinculo indissolubili, commentatio exegetica*. Frib. 1816. § 11 seq.

<sup>2</sup> In regard to the custom of drawing water, see Mishna, Tract. de Tabernac. c. V. segm. 1. and c. 4, segm. 9. 10. "Distribute water at the feast of water, so that thou mayest be blessed with the annual rains." In Tosaphtha, Rosh hashona (De princ. anni) c. I. sect. 8, and Tosaphtha, Succa, c. III. n. 10, we find it threatened that whoever did not visit Jerusalem at this feast, should have no rain upon his lands.

<sup>3</sup> Gemar. Hieros. Tr. Succa, c. V. segm. 1. למה נקרא שמה ביה שואבה ; and Isaiah 12: 3, ושאבתם מים בששון ; and שמשם שואבים רוח הקודש על שם : ממעיני הישועה.

<sup>4</sup> Respecting the illumination, see Mishna, De Tabernac. c. V. segm. 2, 3. Not only psalms but hymns and songs of praise were sung by pious men in the torch-dance, which they conducted with much skill. Ibid. seg. 4.

<sup>5</sup> Lightfoot, Descript. Templi Hierosol. c. XVIII. and XIX.



or receptacle for the offerings, in which our Saviour spoke these words (8: 20).

3. Let us now observe the *acts* of Jesus; e. g. his healing the man who was born blind (9: 1—41), or his raising Lazarus (11: 1—46). The latter narrative in some parts displays the rural simplicity and sweetness of an idyl; and both have in common the characteristic of great particularity. Is it possible that the various feelings of the bystanders, their thoughts, their language, their behaviour, and the incidental circumstances connected with the occurrence, should be exhibited with more exactness? We have before us rather a lively and animated picture than a mere description. If we will but examine these narratives without prepossessions of any kind, and instead of forcing every thing to a previous opinion, permit our judgment to take its spontaneous course, we cannot but see evidence in the account of what was said and done, that the writer was a listener and spectator.

But this very story of Lazarus is the source of a multitude of questions, which are supposed, by those who ask them, to be so many objections. If Jesus wished to raise the dead, it is said, men are constantly dying; why did he not perform the miracle on some dead person close at hand in Jerusalem? I reply by another question: Why the one nearest at hand, and not rather a good man, and a friend? How many friends had Jesus at Jerusalem? Was any one of these, was Nicodemus, was Joseph of Arimathea, at that time dead? Why, it is said, perform the miracle in so insignificant a place as Bethany? True, it was not a place of much importance; but it was in the vicinity and in sight of Jerusalem. The miracle was performed amid a large concourse of people, and, as it were, in Jerusalem itself (11: 19). Though inconceivable, yet it is true, that some were incredulous, and told the Pharisees what had occurred (11: 46). The case was the same, as, according to the accounts of the other Gospels, it always was, when the Pharisees or their adherents witnessed the works of Jesus (Matth. 9: 34. 12: 14. Mark 3: 6. Luke 6: 11. Matth. 12: 22—24. Luke 11: 14, 15. 13: 4). They were wilfully obstinate (Matth. 12: 31, 32. Mark 3: 29). It would even have been singular had no one of the spies of the Pharisees been present. Malice on the part of some is essential to the completeness of the picture, which displays, simply but happily, the various dispositions and feelings of all the spectators.

Finally, by taking away this story we destroy one link in the chain of events. The rejoicing with which the people celebrated Christ's entry into Jerusalem becomes less intelligible; as also the sudden determination of the council to condemn him to death, while before they had not been able to adhere permanently to any such resolution.

4. Let us now turn our attention to other instances of particularity. The writer often designates the time of the occurrences he narrates. The next day (*τῇ ἐπαύριον*) after the inquiry made by the Pharisees, John the Baptist saith etc. (1: 29). The day after, he points out our Lord to two of his disciples who were the first disciples of Jesus (1: 35—42). The day following, Andrew brings his brother to Jesus. One day later, Jesus attaches to himself Philip and Nathaniel (1: 44—51). Three days after this occurrence, our Lord appears at Cana (2: 1 seq.). He leaves Sychar after residing there two days (4: 43). He staid two days after

hearing of the illness of Lazarus (11: 6). After Lazarus was raised from the dead he went once more into retirement (11: 54), and six days before the passover appeared again in Bethany (12: 1). On the following day, when he went to Jerusalem, the people came forth to meet him (12: 9—12). He sometimes even designates the hour. It was the tenth hour when Andrew first visited our Lord (1: 39); the sixth, when our Lord arrived at Jacob's well (4: 6); the seventh, when the nobleman's son at Capernaum began to recover (4: 52).

To these may be added other minute circumstances and designations which could have been known only to a contemporary. Not long after the first passover, there was much water at Salim (3: 23). A certain man, whom Jesus healed, was 38 years old (5: 5). The disciples were five and twenty or thirty furlongs from the land when they saw Jesus (6: 19). The servant whose ear was cut off, was named Malchus (18: 10); it was a kinsman of this servant who consummated Peter's fall (18: 26). The soldiers divided the upper garment into four parts; for it was a *τετραδίου* which guarded the cross (19: 23. Comp. Acts 12: 4). The under garment was without seam (*χιτὼν ἄρραφος*, 19: 23), like a priest's under garment (*χιτὼν οὐκ ἐκ δυοῖν περιτμημάτων, ὥστε ῥαπίος*, Jos. Ant. L. III. c. 7. n. 4). It was therefore not divided; but lots were cast for it. The weight of Mary's ointment was a Litra (12: 3). The articles used in preparing the body for burial, weighed about one hundred Litrai (19: 39). When the disciples came to the sepulchre, they found the linen clothes lying apart, as also the *sudarium* wrapped together by itself (20: 7). Some traits of similar particularity have already been mentioned above (§ 54), in treating of his corrections of his predecessors and the additional completeness which he has imparted to the history.

### § 59.

We cannot discuss particular passages in which writers have contrived to discover references to later circumstances, or absurd explanations, and from which the inference has been drawn that the author wrote absurdly, and at a later period than has been supposed; but we will endeavor to defend him from the charge of ignorance of history and of the geography of the country.

It is objected against him that he places Bethany on the river Jordan, while it was really situated very near Jerusalem. He certainly does mention a Bethany on the Jordan in 1: 28. (Bethany is the true reading here; Bethabara is only a conjecture of Origen's, which was made current by Chrysostom's recommendation). But who can believe that an author, who states with so much precision the distance of Bethany from Jerusalem (viz. 15 furlongs, 11: 18), should have imagined the same town to have been on the Jordan, and even on the eastern side of it? We shall rather be satisfied that he meant to distinguish two different places, if we take the following passages into consideration. Our Lord went again to the eastern side of the Jordan, to the place where John at first baptized (10: 40); that is, in other words, to Bethany (1: 28). From this place he went to Bethany, the town of Mary and Martha (11: 1). Are not here two Bethanys? Although the orthography

of both is the same in Greek, it was not so, probably, in Hebrew. The Bethany near Jerusalem, it is well known, was called בֵּית הַנֶּחְמִי; the one on the Jordan was probably בֵּית אֶנְיָה, *a place for ships*, nearly the same as Bethabara, בֵּית עֶבְרָה, *a place for crossing, a ferry*. It was, then, a thoroughfare from the east country to Palestine and back again; where John must have found a great number of hearers and of candidates for baptism.

The place which the Baptist chose for the second theatre of his labors, was Ænon, near Salim (ἐν Αἰνῶν, ἐγγὺς τοῦ Σαλείμ, 3: 23). It is objected that "urbs Ænon non exstitit." This is admitted; but did John baptize in a *city*? So unfortunate an objection should never have been made by an *exegete*.

A city is mentioned which is called Sychar, Σιχάρ or Συχάρ (4: 5). This, it is said, "alia nisi Sichema esse non potest." And yet it was a different place. Sichem, Flavia Neapolis, and Sychar, belong to different periods, as I shall show in my Geography of Canaan, which I hope will soon be finished. Sychar, however, does not denote either *the drunken*, from שִׁכָּר, nor *the deceitful or faithless*, from שָׁקָר; it is not any opprobrious name. It was spelt סִיכָר, as was long ago remarked;<sup>1</sup> the *burial-place*, where were deposited the bones of Joseph (Josh. 24: 32), and according to the common report in the times of our Saviour, the remains of the twelve patriarchs (Acts 7: 15, 16); as also, according to the declaration of the modern Samaritans, the remains of all the prophets.

### § 60.

John is, moreover, charged with ignorance of history and of Jewish customs, on account of the words, 'Caiaphas being the high priest that same year' (11: 49); as though he meant to have it understood that they were changed every year. Yet, whatever he meant, he was apparently sure of it; for he soon after repeats the declaration, that Caiaphas was the high priest that year (18: 13).

Let us not grudge the pains we must take in examining anew a subject which has been often discussed. We shall go as far back as is necessary in order to set the circumstances of the time in a clear light. After Tiberius had attained the Roman sovereignty, he recalled the procurator Annias Rufus from Judea, and sent thither in his stead Valerius Gratus, who administered the government of Judea eleven years, consequently till some time in the twelfth year of the reign of Tiberius. Gratus deprived *Annas* of the office of high priest, and gave it to Ishmael, the son of Phabi, whom, likewise, he soon deprived of it, in order to bestow it on *Eleazar*, the son of *Annas*. He held the office a year, and was then forced to yield it to Simon, the son of Camithus; who, in turn, held the office for hardly the same length of time, and was then succeeded by Joseph, surnamed Caiaphas.<sup>2</sup>

Caiaphas retained this dignity, the highest in his nation, until Tibe-

<sup>1</sup> Cellarii Dissert. Academic. Diss. 6ta De Gent. Samarit. Histor. et Cere-  
mon. § 15. Lightfoot, Chorograph. Joanni præmissa, C. IV. § 4.

<sup>2</sup> Jos. Antiq. L. XVIII. c. 2. n. 2.

rius sent Vitellius to Syria to regulate or, more correctly speaking, to embroil the affairs of Parthia. Vitellius, after his consulship, was set over the province of Syria,<sup>1</sup> which he governed till the twentieth year of Tiberius. For there were but three consulships after his, in the time of this emperor: in the third the world was delivered from this execrable sovereign.<sup>2</sup>

When Vitellius travelled over his province, and came to Judea, whose procurator was under the authority of the prætor of Syria, he was magnificently received at Jerusalem. He requited the reception by marks of favor, and, to please the people, deprived Caiaphas of the office of high priest.<sup>3</sup> This probably happened in the first year of his prætorship; so that Caiaphas held this dignity as long, at least, as from the twelfth to the twenty-first year of the reign of Tiberius, i. e. nine years; an unheard of thing in those as well as in succeeding times.

*Jonathan*, another son of *Annas*, was next appointed high priest.<sup>4</sup> When Vitellius, however, went to Jerusalem the second time, in the twenty-third and last year of the reign of Tiberius, he deposed Jonathan likewise, and made Theophilus, the third son of *Annas*, his successor.<sup>5</sup> The rapidity with which the high priests, with the exception of Caiaphas, passed before the eyes of the nation, would furnish a good reason why John added the remark in question.

2. But we are led to take a step further. There were at that time in the Jewish council a great number of ἀρχιερεῖς, persons of the rank of high priests, two of whom, according to the Gospel of John, conducted the examination of our Saviour. He was first brought before *Annas*, and then before Caiaphas (18: 13 and 24). Now which of these two was the high priest? It was incumbent on the writer to answer this question for his readers. He has done so, once previously in 11: 49, and here again in 18: 13. He tells us that Caiaphas was high priest that year.

3. What follows may be regarded as completely decisive. Luke designates the time when our Lord was consecrated, not only by stating the year of the emperor's reign, but also by mentioning the names of those who at that time occupied the highest stations in Palestine, viz. Pontius Pilate, the tetrarchs Herod, Philip, and Lysanias, and then the high priests *Annas* and Caiaphas (Luke 3: 1, 2). How happens it that he names two high priests, if there was only one? How happens it that he names them in the order of their age, and consequently gives *Annas* the precedence, if Caiaphas was the only high priest? Most certainly we have here two high priests at the same time. Not long afterward *Annas* appears again with precedence before Caiaphas (Acts 4: 5, 6), which could have been due to him only as being really high priest.

Yet the sacred functions belonging to this office could not be performed by more than one at a time. They must, therefore, have taken turns each year, or each feast. As the presidency of the council and the

<sup>1</sup> Sueton. Vitell. c. 2.

<sup>2</sup> Tacit. Ann. L. VI. c. 31, c. 40, c. 45.

<sup>3</sup> Jos. Ant. L. XVIII. c. 4. n. 3.

<sup>4</sup> Jos. Ant. L. XVIII. c. 4. n. 3.

<sup>5</sup> Jos. Ant. L. XVIII. c. 5. n. 3.



supreme direction of affairs were connected with this office, a yearly change must have been most convenient. So much is deducible merely from the nature of the case. Some circumstances contained in the preceding history will serve to elucidate this subject still further. Of all the rivals of Caiaphas, Annas was the most powerful. He had already held the office of high priest himself, and succeeded in elevating his five sons, one after another, to the same dignity; viz. Eleazar before Caiaphas, and after Caiaphas, Jonathan, Theophilus, one whose name is unknown, and Annas the younger.<sup>1</sup> Caiaphas could not have sustained himself for so many years against the influence and wealth of such a competitor, had he not consented to a measure which would disarm his opposition. For his own security, Caiaphas was compelled to permit him to share his office, and to enter into a compact, which, it seems, was even ratified by a family connexion. Caiaphas took to wife the daughter of Annas (John 18: 13). As usual however, without friendly feelings, two could not long hold the same dignity together. The silence of Josephus cannot be adduced against this, as he had good reason to pass over in silence so discreditable a transaction in regard to the high priest's office. Neither does he state any thing of this kind as to a single one of the many who held the office; although we cannot doubt that more than one obtained it by bribery or purchase. At any rate his mere silence cannot outweigh the express declaration of Luke. Annas and Caiaphas were, therefore, high priests at the same time, but performed the functions of their office alternately.

Not less stress is laid by the opponent of John's history on the irreconcilable discrepancy which is said to exist between it and the other Gospels in regard to the last supper, and the death of Jesus. Let us attempt to reconcile it.

Some days before the passover our Lord entered Jerusalem in considerable state (Matth. 21: 1 seq. Mark 11: 1. Luke 19: 29); but returned to Bethany to lodge (Matth. 21: 17. Mark 11: 11). He visited Jerusalem and the temple a second time (Matth. 21: 18. Mark 11: 15), and a third (Mark 11: 27. Matth. 21: 23). There now remained two days before the feast of unleavened bread (Mark 14: 1. Matth. 26: 2). Hence five days elapsed after his entry into Jerusalem before the feast of unleavened bread. Just so in John: Jesus arrived at Bethany six days before the passover (12: 1); and on the next day, τῇ ἐπαύριον, i. e. five days before the passover, our Lord made his entry into Jerusalem (12: 12). As yet, there is not the slightest discrepancy. Now if, as we design to show, the feast of the passover that year began, according to the custom of the Jews, on Thursday evening; reckoning back six days, Thursday excluded, we find that our Saviour arrived at Bethany on Friday of the preceding week, and visited the temple on the Sabbath, amid the acclamations of the people. He visited it a second and third time on our Sunday and Monday; after which there were two days, Tuesday and Wednesday, remaining before the Thursday on which the ἄζυμα commenced.

Before speaking of the passover, we will first inquire when our Lord died? He died and was buried on the preparation-day, the παρασκευή

<sup>1</sup> Jos. Ant. L. XX. c. 9. at the beginning

(Matth. 27: 62. Mark 15: 42. Luke 23: 54). In John's Gospel too, it is stated that it was the *παρασκευή* on which he was crucified (19: 14), taken down from the cross (19: 31), and carried to the sepulchre (19: 42). This day corresponds to our Friday; for the *παρασκευή* was the *προσάββατον* (Mark 15: 42), or the day immediately followed by the Sabbath (Luke 23: 54). This Sabbath, however, was one of peculiar importance (John 19: 31), because the passover fell upon it (John 19: 14, ἥν γὰρ παρασκευὴ τὸν πάσχα). So far there is nothing which disturbs the harmony of the Evangelists.

The difficulty lies elsewhere, viz. in the expression, *the first day of unleavened bread*. The disciples inquired of our Lord on the first day of unleavened bread, ἡ πρώτη τῶν ἁζύμων, where he would have the passover prepared, and immediately received command what to do in order to make ready the passover (Matth. 26: 17. Mark 14: 12. Luke 22: 7). According to Mosaic institution, the passover began to be observed on the 14th of Nisan at evening, and extended to the evening of the 15th, בֵּין הָעֶרְבַּיִם (Ex. 12: 6 seq. Num. 9: 1—6. Deut. 16: 5—8); and at this time unleavened bread began to be eaten (Ex. 12: 18. Num. 28: 17). In the case under consideration, therefore, the first day of unleavened bread was the Sabbath, on which the passover happened to fall. Now according to the Evangelists (it is objected), Jesus observed the passover on the first day of unleavened bread; and yet on the first day of unleavened bread, or on the Sabbath, he was already in the grave. This objection is unanswerable, if we decide the case solely according to the Mosaic regulations; if we do not take into account innovations which gradually crept in.

After their return from Babylon the Jews were more religious than they had ever been before. In many things they were desirous of doing beyond what Moses required of them, and overburdened themselves with countless ceremonies. They were not content merely to keep the feasts which were ordained by Moses, but desired to honor and sanctify them still more by observing the preceding day; and in this the Galileans even surpassed the Jews. When this custom was first introduced cannot be ascertained. Mention is made of it in the book of Judith (8: 6). In the days of our Saviour, however, as it seems from the Gospels, it was universally prevalent.

The fishermen and millers of Tiberias, Sephor, and Acco, observed the day preceding the feast, and left off their usual occupations.<sup>1</sup> In Judea it was customary on the *day before the passover* to work till noon; but in Galilee no work was done during the *whole day*.<sup>2</sup> The duties of the temple on the day before the passover, we are told by the Mishna, were the same as on the Sabbath, except that the priest, contrary to the wish of the wise, was in the habit of cleansing the court from the

<sup>1</sup> Gemar. Hieros. Tract. Moed. Katon c. 11. seg. 5. קיבלו עליהם חמצי טיבריא עדושי עכו וגורסי ציפורים שלא לשנות מלאכה בחולו של מועד:

<sup>2</sup> Mischn. Tract. de Pasch. c. 14. seg. 5. ביהודה היו עושין מלאכה בעיבי בחדש עד חצות ובגליל לא היו עושין כל עקר:

blood.<sup>1</sup> The Jerusalem Gemara asserts unconditionally that the day before the passover is as sacred as the passover itself.<sup>2</sup>

The new opinion in regard to the sacred character of the day preceding the passover brought along with it a change in respect to the exclusion of leaven from the houses. It could no longer be used on a day which was now esteemed holy. On this account all the places where leaven might be deposited were examined at candle-lighting on the evening of the day before; i. e. on Thursday evening, for the Jewish and Babylonish day commenced at evening.<sup>3</sup> This was the practice in Judea, although the whole of the day previous was not accounted sacred. In Galilee, however, where the הלכה, or observance, was more strict, and the whole day was holy, no work being performed upon it, it was necessary that this examination should be made before the commencement of the day, i. e. before the evening of Thursday. Hence Thursday before evening night, from the custom in Galilee, be called the time of unleavened bread. It may even have been the case that the natural day, Thursday, was universally termed the day of unleavened bread; for in several instances in the sacred writings the word day is thus used to mean only the natural day.

But a difficulty, at least an apparent one, still remains. "And the first day of unleavened bread, *when they killed the passover*," ὅτε τὸ πάσχα ἔθνον (Mark 14: 12). When *who* killed the passover? Is it meant, when *the Jews* killed the passover? By no means; for they ate the passover on Friday evening (John 18: 28). Mark is not speaking of the Jews, but the *disciples*, μαθηταί; and means to say that they killed the passover the same day on which they made inquiry of Jesus in respect to it. The case is the same as to the words of Luke: "Then came the day of unleavened bread, when the passover *must* be killed" (22: 7). The words ὑπὸ τῶν μαθητῶν, *by the disciples*, are understood; *must*, in order that they might have the pleasure of keeping it with our Lord. Nor is there anything contradictory to this in John's account: "Now before the feast of the passover (πρὸ τῆς ἑορτῆς τοῦ πάσχα, i. e. before the Jews killed the paschal lamb, when Jesus knew that his hour was come, etc. (13: 1).

It was on Thursday, then, on the first day of unleavened bread, at evening, that our Lord kept the passover. Before he sat down with the disciples to *his supper*, the supper of the new covenant, he girded himself and washed their feet, as was the custom on the part of *hosts* towards their guests (John 13: 1—12 seq.).

But did our Lord slay the passover one day earlier than the Jews? Why not? It was not his design to render the 14th day of Nisan, or the paschal lamb, or any of the solemnities of the Jewish passover, sacred in the estimation of his followers. Here we might rest the matter; but we add further the following remark. It is, nevertheless, probable that Jesus kept the passover in accordance with the rites of his nation at

<sup>1</sup> Misch. Tr. de Pasch. c. 5. seg. 8. כמנעשו בחול כד מנעשו בשבת אלא שהכניסו מזהבם את העזזה שלא ברצון הכמים;

<sup>2</sup> Gemar. Hieros. Tr. Chagiga. c. III. seg. 7; כן ערב נפסח הפסח ויום טבח כעצרת;

<sup>3</sup> Misch. Tr. de Pasch. c. I. seg. 1. אור לא-בעת עשר בודקים את החמץ לאור חור;

that period. The custom of celebrating the preceding day in the temple, with as much solemnity as the feast-day itself, favored the opinion that the two days were equally holy; and from the positive declaration in the Gemara, that the day before the passover is as holy as the passover itself, it is a logical conclusion, that, at least under certain circumstances, the passover might be eaten on the former. Jesus justifies himself by circumstances for keeping the passover on this day. His words are (Matth. 26: 18), Say unto him (the man), the Master saith, My time is at hand (Ὁ καιρὸς μου ἐγγύς ἐστι· i. e. the time of my death); as much as to say, I have no time to lose, if I intend to eat the passover. If it had never been allowable to eat the passover on the day preceding the feast, the reason assigned would not have justified Jesus in doing so, nor could it have made his message to the man at all intelligible to him. Now before the feast of the passover, Jesus knowing (says John in exculpation of him, as it were), that the hour of his departure from this world was at hand (13: 1), sat down to supper with his disciples.

But if the day preceding the passover was so holy, how could the high priests and their adherents occupy themselves upon it with the trial of Jesus? They could do so without scruple; for among the Jews it was allowable to employ the whole morning in business and labor. It was only among the Galileans that the stricter custom prevailed of keeping the entire day holy.

Lastly, the writer has been charged with ignorance of the Jewish language, on account of the explanation contained in 9: 7, Σιλωάμ, ὃ ἐρμηνεύεται ἀπεσταλμένος, Siloam which is by interpretation Sent. The word occurs generally in this form (Siloam) in Josephus, who had before his eyes the national custom of his time. Its root is properly שָׁלַח (Isai. 8: 6), which, indeed, in this form, does not signify *one sent*. But it must not be forgotten that in those times mysteries and occult meanings were sought for in proper names; as e. g. by Philo frequently, and sometimes by Paul: "For this Agar is Mt. Sinai in Arabia" (Gal. 4: 25); Melchisedek signifies *king of righteousness*, and his being king of Salem denotes that he was *king of peace* (βασιλεὺς εἰρήνης, Heb. 7: 2). This pursuit of etymological mysteries led to the higher sense of שְׁלַח among the Jews. The word שָׁלַח has various meanings according to the vowels with which it is furnished; and, among others that of שְׁלִיחַ, ἀπεσταλμένος. Now it made no difference whether the writer applied the concealed signification to Jesus who sent, or to the blind man who was sent; either application was in accordance with the custom of learned Jews.

The observation on which we are commenting arose from a peculiarity of the writer, who, penetrated with the conviction of the divine origin of Jesus, was strongly disposed to discern something deep and mystic in his conduct and fortunes upon earth, and frequently introduces into his book remarks of this nature, which were sometimes his own, and sometimes made by his fellow-disciples (2: 17. 12: 16. 11: 51, 52. 12: 37—42. 18: 32. 19: 36, 37). Connected with this is another peculiarity viz. that of accompanying our Lord's words with explanations (2: 22. 6: 64, 65, 71. 7: 39. 12: 33. 13: 11).

We have now met the charge which has been made against the au-



thor of this Gospel, of blundering in respect to the geography, usages, and language of Palestine, and we recur to the more general observations on the characteristics of the book, which were deserted by us for the discussion in the preceding sections. Those observations, and all that has been said of the procedure of the writer in relation to the particular parts of his Gospel (aside from the general structure of the whole, which we do not consider at present), conduct us to the following conclusions. His representations appear to have been drawn from the very life, and comprise the most minute references to the circumstances and deportment of the actors and spectators. They are always, however, simple and unlabored, as though they were ingenuous narratives of things witnessed by himself. They resemble a picture in which every figure *tells*, each in its own way; in which not one is without its effect, and all have reference, more or less, according to their different characters, to the principal subject. The relation of what befell Jesus, which is interwoven throughout the book, proceeds so naturally, that without it we should not have a complete developement of our Lord's life and actions. In respect to *minutiæ*, such as the day, the hour etc., and generally in the circumstantial representation of occurrences, he is not equalled by any other of the Evangelists. In the very things which have been erroneously regarded as mistakes, he has evinced a peculiarly accurate knowledge of circumstances of time and place. Discourses are given with such particularity as no one could have been able to exhibit, except a hearer of them, and sometimes involve allusions to places and circumstances, which would have escaped a writer not so well informed.

### § 64.

The first three Evangelists have divided their history into Journeys made from Capernaum. These form with them so many sections of the narrative. John, however, arranges events according to a chronological principle of division. His chronology is regulated by means of six Jewish feasts, five of which were kept by Jesus at Jerusalem.

The first of these feasts is a passover (2: 13); the second is merely called generally, a feast of the Jews (ἐορτὴ τῶν Ἰουδαίων, 5: 1). The rest, again, are all definitely designated by name. The third was a passover (6: 4), the next the feast of tabernacles (7: 2), the next the feast of the dedication (10: 22), and then comes the final passover.

In the ancient world, and particularly among the Jews, feasts were the popular measures of time. To neglect these, and attend only to local circumstances in the succession of events in John, would be rejecting definite statements of time, on account of a mere dispute about words. For the place and the time, the feast and the Holy City, are here inseparable. The events occurred at a feast; the feast was in the Holy City. On any other supposition we must assume that the historian put the last feast before the first, and arranged them all solely according to his fancy; while the contrary is very clear.

John, it seems, has mentioned but one of these feasts indefinitely, under the general designation, ἐορτὴ τῶν Ἰουδαίων, a feast of the Jews (5: 1).

Some have been inclined to consider this as having been a passover, because of the preceding conversation, in which our Lord among other things says: "Say not ye, There are yet four months, and then cometh the harvest? Lift up your eyes, and look on the fields; for they are white already to harvest (4: 35). Now the harvest began at the end of the feast of the passover; and therefore it has been inferred that the next feast was a feast of the passover.<sup>1</sup>

But there was one still nearer at hand; and hence the inference is uncertain: for it could not be conclusive unless the feast of the passover were the only one during this period. Within the four months, about a month earlier than the passover, occurred the Purim feast; which was in a peculiar sense the feast of the Jews.

There is the less reason to doubt that this is the feast which is meant, as the passover is represented to have occurred a few days after, when Jesus had returned from what is termed the feast of the Jews (5: 1—6: 1, 4). On this supposition, too, we should expect the rest to have happened as John relates; viz. that our Lord would let this passover go by unobserved, working miracles and teaching in Galilee, inasmuch as he had just reached home from Jerusalem.

On the other hand, if, as is proposed, we consider this feast as a passover, we involve ourselves in fresh difficulty. As our Lord stayed at home over the passover which is mentioned a few days after his return, there must have been, from the first supposed passover to the one which he omitted to keep, a whole year, and from the latter six months more to the feast of tabernacles; during all which time he was not in Jerusalem, and, contrary to the public institutions, omitted religious observances for more than a year and a half, thus exposing himself to universal censure and reproach.

So far our position is justified and confirmed. On the other hand, it is objected, that John calls the feast in question merely a *feast*, ἐορτή, in which case the term must designate the passover, κατ' ἐξοχήν, as the greatest of the feasts. The following passages, it is said, are proofs of this, viz. Matth. 27: 15. Mark 15: 6. Luke 23: 17. John 4: 45. But these passages are all preceded by a definite statement that the feast was a passover. Hence it was not necessary, in the course of the narrative, to repeat the word passover perpetually; but the general term feast was sufficient, in conformity with the usage of all languages. John proceeds in a similar manner in regard to the feast of tabernacles. After designating it by name (7: 2), he expresses himself only in a general way in the sequel: Jesus went up to *the feast*; about the middle of *the feast*; in the last day of *the feast* (7: 10, 14, 37).

Why do we not likewise infer from this, that when the word feast is put by itself, we are to understand feast of tabernacles? The case is precisely the same; the passages before mentioned are of the same nature as these: It was the passover; they thought to take him, but not at *the feast*; it was usual at *the feast*, etc.

As this objection, which is the principal one urged against our position, has thus been obviated, it may seem superfluous to add anything

<sup>1</sup> Scaliger, De Emendat. temporum, L. VI. p. 257. Ed. Francof. 1593. Lightfoot, *Horæ Hebraicæ*. ad h. l.

further in order to elucidate the point under consideration. Yet we wish it to be observed that the historian does not call the feast in question simply *ἑορτή*, but *ἑορτὴ τῶν Ἰουδαίων*. The addition so alters the import of the expression, that it is possible to render it in two different ways. *ἑορτὴ τῶν Ἰουδαίων* may mean merely a feast of the Jews, or, by way of eminence, the Jewish feast. But, it may be said, it should in the latter case be *ἡ ἑορτὴ τῶν Ἰουδαίων*. Very well; but do not important Mss. contain this reading? Add to these the Memphitic version, which exhibits the same. What, moreover, is most probable, considering the custom of the historian? He designates all the other feasts by name, *πάσχα τῶν Ἰουδαίων* (2: 13), *τὸ πάσχα, ἡ ἑορτὴ τῶν Ἰουδαίων* (6: 4), *ἡ ἑορτὴ τῶν Ἰουδαίων, ἡ σκηνοπηγία* (7: 2), *ἐγκαίνια ἐν τοῖς Ἱεροσολύμοις* (10: 22); and, judging from his usual custom, this must be the proper name of the feast. Perhaps it was the name commonly given to it by the Asiatics. No feast was so proper to be called, by way of eminence, the Jewish feast, as the Purim. It was the commemoration of their miraculous preservation, *festum ob servatos Judæos*. The amusements of the occasion, too, were such as to make it rather a feast of the people (*יום טוב הייהודים*) than a religious solemnity. In every point of view it is exactly designated by the term, feast of the Jews.

Besides, it was in such high estimation among the Jews, that while the prophets, the Hagiographa, and usages, were to be done away by the Messiah in his new dispensation, the law of Moses and the Purim feast were excepted.<sup>1</sup> Our Lord's desire to prevent unnecessary hindrances to belief in his Messiahship may have been the reason why he paid regard to this feeling of the people and proved his respect for the feast by observing it.

For the sake of completeness, however, we must mention, that the words in John 6: 4, *ἣν δὲ ἐγγὺς τὸ πάσχα, ἡ ἑορτὴ τῶν Ἰουδαίων*, have been sometimes regarded as an interpolation. As the learned believed they were to regard the feast so indefinitely mentioned, as a passover, and, on the other hand, knew too well that another passover could not succeed in the course of a few days, they sought to make out the troublesome words to be suspicious. There were no internal grounds of suspicion, except their inconsistency with an opinion which was regarded as the only possible one.<sup>2</sup> Nor were there any external grounds. All

<sup>1</sup> Gemar. Hieros. Tract. Megill. Cap. I. Const. VIII. The Megillah of the dedication will cease, but the Purim-feast will not, *בטלה מגילת חנוכה ופורים לא, בטלה*. Shortly after: The prophets and Hagiographa will be done away; but not the books of the law. Directly after is subjoined: Nor shall the Megillah of Esther be done away, nor the legal observances: *אף מגילת אסתר והלכות*—See a similar passage from Rabbi Ben Maiemon in Hottinger's Thes. Phil. seu Clavis Script. L. II. c. 1. sect. 3. The prophetic writings and Hagiographa will be done away in the days of the Messiah, except the book of Esther, which is perpetual like the books of the law.

<sup>2</sup> The Bp. of Landaff presents to view all the learning which has been exhibited on this subject, "Notes and Additions to Michaelis' Introd." Germ. Ed. Part II. p. 50 [2d Eng. Ed. Vol. III. P. 2. p. 56 seq.] and impartially considers the whole matter to be, as it really is, mere conjecture.

the Mss. and versions contradict the supposition;<sup>1</sup> nor can their testimony be altered by the decision which has recently been pronounced.

We have then in John the following feasts, the Purim, the passover, the feast of tabernacles, the feast of the dedication, and the last passover; only three passovers in all, though the ancients sometimes assert that there were more.<sup>2</sup> All these three feasts, however, do not make the duration of his ministry to have been more than two years. On the first, he made known his Messianic dignity and mission in the Holy City; during the second, as he had just returned from the feast of Purim, he remained in Galilee; and on the third he closed his career as a teacher. From the first to the third are two years; perhaps six or seven weeks more should be added, taking into account the time from his baptism to the first passover.

## § 62.

To get a clear idea of the structure of the Gospels, the first three of which describes scenes in Galilee alone, and the fourth almost exclusively occurrences in Judea, we must seek out the points of contact between them. I commence this inquiry with the confession that I have to correct a former error, which merited severe censure.

The first three contain accounts of several of our Lord's journeys; John's contains accounts of his visits to the feasts at Jerusalem. A question here arises, which is of importance in regard to all the Gospels; and that is, which of these journeys coincide with the five feasts which led Jesus to the Holy City?

John the Baptist appears as our Lord's forerunner. Our Lord after his baptism withdraws into the wilderness, and, the next day after the inquiry made of John by certain persons sent to him from Jerusalem, returns to John (1: 29). On the following day he obtains his first two disciples (1: 35—41), and on the next Simon Peter (42—44). The day after, Philip and Nathaniel become his disciples; on which account he postpones his intention of going into Galilee. Three days after, however, he appears in Cana (2: 1). He then repairs to Capernaum (2: 12), takes up his abode there a few days, and afterwards goes to Jerusalem to keep the first passover (2: 13 seq.).

Here, in the concourse at the feast, in the midst of his countrymen, in the temple of the metropolis, he first authoritatively announces himself, revealing his dignity and proclaiming his mission (2: 13—3: 22). Leaving the Holy City, he takes up his abode on the Jordan, baptizing and teaching (3: 22—36), till a comparison between him and the Baptist, which might have been prejudicial to the latter, induces him to leave this region, whence he passes through Samaria and Sychar to Galilee (4: 1—5). At Sychar he remains two days (4: 43), and then enters

<sup>1</sup> Kuinoel, *Comm. in libr. N. T. Hist. Vol. III. Evang. Joan.* has very rightly opposed to this idea the agreement of Mss. and versions in regard to John 6: 4.

<sup>2</sup> *Iren. L. II. Adv. Hær. c. 22. Apollinar. apud Hieronym. in Dan. IX. 2. Epiphan. Hær. LI.* The various and strange opinions on the duration of our Lord's ministry may be found enumerated in the Notes and Additions to Michaelis' *Introd. I. Th. p. 51—55. [Eng. Ed. Vol. III. Part 2d, p. 62.]*



Galilee; visits Cana again, and on his way to Capernaum performs his second miracle in Galilee (43—54).

How long he abode on the banks of the Jordan, we can see from the conversation on the way home (4: 35). There are yet four months, and then cometh harvest. Harvest fell in the middle of April; hence Jesus was on his way home about the middle of our December, when the weather in Palestine is unfavorable for occupations in the open air; and from the passover to this time, a period of *eight months*, he had employed himself in Judea in gathering his early disciples and adherents.

Now when Jesus arrives in Galilee, and approaches Capernaum, John breaks off his narrative, as though nothing further occurred in this region. He immediately begins: "After this there was a feast of the Jews, and Jesus went up to Jerusalem" (5: 1). Did nothing happen here, then? did Jesus come here only to travel back?

The occurrences in Galilee are the province of the other Evangelists; in whom, consequently, we must seek for them. We will cite Luke in behalf of all the three Evangelists, as being the last of them. Jesus visits Nazareth, the place where he had been brought up; is not honored there (Luke 4: 16—31), and

#### I. Returns to Capernaum.

- (a) Heals the demoniac in the synagogue.
- (b) Enters Simon's house.
- (c) Enters Simon's ship.
- (d) Heals the leper.

#### II. Jesus comes again to Capernaum, as Mark (2: 1) states more distinctly.

- (a) Heals a paralytic.
- (b) Calls Matthew, or Levi.
- (c) The disciples of John fast.
- (d) The disciples of Jesus go through the corn-fields.

#### III. Jesus returns to Capernaum (Mark 3: 1. Luke 6: 6).

- (a) Heals the man with a withered hand.
- (b) Chooses the twelve. Delivers a discourse (the sermon on the mount) to them and the surrounding multitude.
- (c) Heals the centurion's servant.
- (d) Goes to Nain.
- (e) The disciples of John inquire whether Jesus is he that should come?
- (f) The woman that was a sinner anoints our Lord.
- (g) Many adhere to him; Mary Magdalene, Joanna the wife of Chuza, etc.
- (h) The mother and brethren of Jesus come to see him.
- (i) Jesus sleeps in the storm; arrives at Gadaris.
- (k) Restores to life the daughter of Jairus.

#### IV. Jesus arrives in his own country (Mark 6: 1).

- (a) He gives the twelve power over demons.
- (b) Herod believes that John is risen.
- (c) The twelve return, and relate what they have done.
- (d) Jesus feeds the five thousand.

At this point (Matth. 14: 13. Mark 6: 35. Luke 9: 12), John joins in the narrative again, and relates with the rest the feeding of the five thousand, and the appearance of Jesus on the sea, which was connected with it (John 6: 1—22). This is a point at which all the biographers of our Lord meet after a long separation. The occurrence, according to John, took place soon after the feast of the Jews (Purim) (5: 1—6: 22), a few days before the second passover (6: 4).

Now when did our Lord go down from Galilee to attend the feast of the Jews? We have no trace of the fact in the first and second Journeys. In the *third Journey*, however, his departure to this feast is indicated by Luke. Our Lord gradually moves downward from Galilee; his fame goes before him in the direction of Judea (Luke 7: 17). He is already approaching the borders of Samaria, and is passing through Nain; for the usual route from Galilee to Jerusalem by way of Samaria lay through Nain.<sup>1</sup>

The Baptist hears of his approach, and is not able to understand it. For this several reasons may be assigned, drawn from preceding occurrences. Our Lord had not long since left Judea, and was now, so soon, returning. It was much too early for the passover, which he had chosen the first time as the occasion on which to show himself to the people. Was he about to employ himself again in baptizing on the banks of the Jordan? But he had once relinquished this employment, that he might not restrict the Baptist's operations. Could it be one, or a party, of the disciples of Jesus, that was coming with a commission to baptize in his name on the banks of the Jordan? All was uncertain. If it was Jesus himself, respect required him to send a deputation to receive him; if it was not, it was proper to send messengers for the sake of learning the fact.

According to Luke, the party arrived in the vicinity of Jerusalem, and there the woman that was a sinner anointed our Lord; for she dwelt in Bethany. Luke, it is true, as we have before remarked, has given this event too early a position; yet his assignment of the occurrence to this period must have been based on the knowledge that Jesus was on his way to the Holy City, and had already come into its neighborhood.

What he did there is to be sought for in John (5: 1—6: 1). Our Lord was at the feast of the Jews.

Meanwhile, it would seem (third Journey f, g, h), Luke begins to relate the return home (8: 1); the retinue of Jesus is augmented (8: 2, 3). On the way, the mother and brethren of Jesus come to him and desire to see him (8: 19). This fit of solicitude to see him is without any motive or connexion in the Gospels. On the supposition, however, that Jesus was returning from the feast, nothing is more natural than this desire to see him, and learn what he had done and what had befallen him there. The Journey continues, the travellers reach home; and soon after we find Jesus on the sea of Tiberias (8: 22). He crosses over to Gadaris; restores to life the daughter of Jairus; sends forth the twelve; and, after their return, feeds the five thousand (8: 26—9: 11).

This occurrence, viz. the story of the five thousand (fourth Journey,

<sup>1</sup> Jos. Ant. L. XX. c. 6. Comp. Part I. sect. 4. of this *Introd.*

d), is, as we have said, the point at which all the Gospels unite. John narrates it, because Jesus, having just returned from the feast of the Jews, abode in Galilee during the passover; and particularly, because a discourse was connected therewith, which would be unintelligible without it, and was peculiarly adapted to John's purpose. In it our Lord spoke in a more striking manner than on any other occasion concerning his high origin and dignity (6: 22—71). With this discourse John abruptly breaks off his narration. It was not the period of the passover; Jesus spent more than six months in Galilee before the next feast; and yet John speaks directly of a conference in regard to going up to Jerusalem to the feast of tabernacles (7: 1 seq.).

Did nothing occur in Galilee during six months? A great deal. After the narrative concerning the five thousand, Matthew and Mark (for in Luke occurs the chasm mentioned in § 41) proceed as follows. Some Pharisees arrive from Jerusalem who censure the disciples for eating with unwashed hands (Matth. 15: 1—21. Mark 7: 1—14). Jesus goes into the region of Tyre, and heals the daughter of the woman of Canaan (Matth. 15: 21—29. Mark 7: 24—31); he travels about near the sea of Galilee performing miracles, heals a deaf and dumb person (Matth. 15: 29—32. Mark 7: 31—37), and then feeds the four thousand (Matth. 15: 32—39. Mark 8: 1—10). After the narrative in respect to the four thousand, Luke joins the other two again. Jesus inquires of his disciples, Whom do men say that I am (Matth. 17: 13. Mark 8: 27. Luke 9: 18)? He is transfigured on the mount (Matth. 17: 1. Mark 9: 2. Luke 9: 18). The disciples cannot cure a demoniac (Matth. 17: 14. Mark 9: 14. Luke 9: 37); and dispute about precedence (Matth. 18: 1. Mark 9: 33. Luke 9: 46). All these events occurred in Galilee, partly on the northern border of the country, and partly on the western, towards Phœnicia.

After these accounts, Matthew and Mark hasten to the conclusion of their history. Jesus goes to Jerusalem to meet his death (Matth. 19: 1. Mark 10: 1). In John, on the contrary, he is represented as living a great while longer; he travels twice to Jerusalem, to the *feast of tabernacles* (7: 1—3), and to that of the *dedication* (10: 22), and then, finally, to the last passover.

It is not to be denied that there are here great chasms in the first two histories. Where are the occurrences between the two visits to the temple? where the accounts of the journey to each of these feasts? They are wanting; and the history is here deficient in respect to some essential parts. It certainly was so, and it would, moreover, have continued so, had not Luke supplied these portions of the history, which escaped the attention of his predecessors. But while the latter go on to describe the last journey of Jesus to Jerusalem, Luke narrates two journeys to the Holy City, which they do not mention (9: 51 and 13: 22), and which we before designated (§ 42) as the most remarkable portion of original historical matter furnished by this writer.

If, now, we connect these journeys with their corresponding feasts; one with the feast of tabernacles, the other with that of the dedication, we shall obtain a simple and complete whole, without doing any violence to the narration.

We have thus combined all the important facts of the four historical books into one whole, and have given a general solution of what has

been always considered the most difficult problem in regard to them. We have executed what is technically called a *Harmony*.

### § 63.

After thus entering into the fundamental plan of the Gospels, comparing their materials, arrangement, mutual relation, and respective modes of treating the history, and analysing in detail the portions of the whole which are presented by each, and their historical characteristics, we can now deduce a general conclusion concerning their value and authority, which is the ultimate and most important object of such an investigation.

We have before us, as historians, four men who have delineated the acts and doctrines of Jesus. Of these, two were not only contemporaries but friends and disciples of our Lord, and mostly eye-witnesses of his actions. Of the two others, who lived in intimacy with his contemporaries and confidential friends, one wrote from the dictation of the disciple on whom Jesus placed most reliance, and on whom he rested the success of his plans as on a rock; the other was a man of learning, acquainted with the duties of an historian, and connected with the immediate disciples of Jesus by co-operation in his purposes, and, lastly, was himself in the country and on the theatre of events, at the period when they occurred, and followed their progress with an observing eye. It would certainly be extremely difficult to find an example of any great man or philosopher, whose actions have been preserved to posterity by writers so many in number, so worthy of credit on account of their knowledge of the subject, and so capable in every point of view.

Now these four authors wrote and published their works at different periods; the second having the first, the third his two predecessors, and the fourth all the rest, before him. Each of them considered his duty and his merit to consist in surpassing the narrative of his predecessor in accuracy. The second amended the work of his predecessor in point of arrangement and chronology, and was intent upon more exact particularity and precision, about which the latter felt no anxiety. In other respects, he constantly adheres to the narrative and even phraseology of his predecessor so closely, that we readily perceive his work to be only a collection of critical notes upon the other. The third subjected every thing to fresh examination, and added whatever had been left unobserved by the second, which would improve the narrative of the first in point of particularity or precision, as well as whatever was wanting in both; and, by the aid of his investigations, made a new revision of all the existing narratives respecting Jesus. Finally, the fourth saw the works of all the others, and gave the last finish to their accounts, and, likewise, by supplying what had all along been omitted, to the whole history.

Thus there was a general emulation in respect to accuracy, minuteness, and fidelity; we perceive no consideration for each other, no fear of contradiction, no forbearance, much less any mutual understanding. The second work, in fact, is a *critique* on the first, the third on the second, and the fourth on all the preceding; and if either writer had ven-



tured to say what was not true, his successor would have made it a point to correct it. Now where can there be found a history which bears such indubitable marks of pure endeavor after truth, as are contained in the impartial exertions and many successive amendments of emulous individuals, which are brought to view in our investigations respecting these Gospels?

I will here subjoin a fine passage from John Chrysostom. It is from the Preface to his Homilies on Matthew.<sup>1</sup>

Τί οὖν; οὐκ ἤρκει εἰς εὐαγγελιστῆς πάντα εἰπεῖν; Ἡρκει μὲν· ἀλλὰ καὶ τέσσαρες οἱ γραφοντες ὥσι, μήτε κατὰ τοὺς αὐτοὺς καιροὺς, μήτε ἐν τοῖς αὐτοῖς τόποις, μήτε συνελθόντες καὶ διαλεχθέντες ἀλλήλοις· εἶτα ὥσπερ ἀφ' ἐνὸς στόματος πάντα φθέγγονται, μεγίστη τῆς ἀληθείας ἀπόδειξις τοῦτο γίνεται. Καὶ μὴν τοῦναντίον συνέβη, φησί· πολλαχοῦ γὰρ διαφωνοῦντες ἐλέγχονται. Αὐτὸ μὲν οὖν τοῦτο μέγιστον δείγμα τῆς ἀληθείας ἐστίν. Εἰ γὰρ πάντα συνεφώνησαν μετ' ἀκριβείας, καὶ μέχοι καιρὸν, καὶ μέχοι τόπον, καὶ μέχοι ὅρημάτων αὐτῶν, οὐδεὶς ἂν ἐπίστευσε τῶν ἐχθρῶν, ὅτι μὴ συνελθόντες ἀπὸ συνθήκης τινὸς ἀνθρωπίνης ἔγραψαν ἅπερ ἔγραψαν· οὐ γὰρ εἶναι τῆς ἀπλότητος τὴν τοσαύτην συμφωνίαν. Νυνὶ δὲ καὶ ἡ δοκῶσα ἐν μικροῖς εἶναι διαφωνία, πάσης ἀπαλλάττει αὐτοὺς ὑποψίας, καὶ λαμπρῶς ὑπὲρ τοῦ τρόπου τῶν γραψάντων ἀπολογεῖται. Εἰ δέ τι περὶ καιρῶν ἢ τόπων διαφόρως ἀπήγγειλαν, τοῦτο οὐδὲν βλάπτουσι τῶν εἰρημένων τὴν ἀλήθειαν.

So far Chrysostom; and now we surrender these books into the hands of theologians, whose province it is to inquire what share of their composition is to be attributed to a higher than human power.

### § 64.

We must recur once more to John's Gospel, in order, if possible, to discover the place of its composition and destination, and the period of its publication. From indications contained in the work itself, it would seem that our author had foreigners in his eye in composing it. He puts himself in their situation, and speaks of his countrymen as of a people foreign to himself and to his readers. The Jews said; the Jews did; there was a feast of the Jews; it is the custom of the Jews. It is always οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι, not as in the other Gospels, ὁ λαὸς, οἱ ὄχλοι, τὸ πλῆθος. Then, too, he interprets words belonging to the national tongue; as *ἡμεῖς* (I. 42), *ἡμεῖς* (19: 13). So common a word as Messiah must be explained: 'which is *Χριστός*' (1: 42). He does not even consider the word Rabbi as intelligible to his readers (1: 39). For the same reason, he deemed it necessary to inform them respecting the relation existing between the Jews and Samaritans (4: 9); of the fact that the Galileans also went up to the feast (4: 45); respecting the Jewish custom of purification (2: 6), and their mode of burying the dead (19: 40). Those for whom he intended his Gospel were, therefore, at least most of them, heathen; and, judging from the language of the book, most probably Greeks.

<sup>1</sup> The author has given a translation of the passage into German, for which I have substituted the original Greek.—TR.

Nothing is of more avail in elucidation of the circumstances of a writer than his letters, if any such chance to descend to posterity. This advantage we actually enjoy in the present case. Let us therefore examine them, to see if they afford us any information concerning the history of the writer or concerning his work.

### § 65.

#### FIRST EPISTLE OF JOHN.

This epistle has so visible a reference to John's Gospel that I cannot but think they belong together.

Yet, according to some recent observations by a celebrated writer, the two compositions were separated from each other by a considerable period of time, and the Epistle bears evident marks of later origin than the Gospel. "The Gospel," it is said, "is written with manly energy, and the Epistle with feebleness; the Gospel evinces the vigor of the prime of life, and the Epistle the weakness of old age; the former evinces the order, brevity, and precision of the most perfect possession of the mental powers, and the latter in its want of order, repetitions, and verbosity, betrays the loss of memory and judgment, and consequently was written in the decline of life."<sup>1</sup>

A close examination, however, will not confirm these positions. With what minuteness does John present our Lord's discourses, as though he meant that not a single word of them should escape him! Look, for example, at a discourse extending through four entire chapters (14—18). There is not a trace here of the bold manner of writing of a historian in his prime, condensing the substance of long addresses into a brief synoptical form. With what anxious exactness does he relate how certain persons interrupted our Lord in his discourses; how he replied, they rejoined, he said, etc. (8: 12—59. 7: 24—71). Look at the conversations which he relates (3: 1—22. 4: 4—42); and observe the tone of his narratives of what Jesus did; e. g. the healing of the blind man (9: 1—41), the raising of Lazarus (11: 1—46). Does the account of a miracle occur in Matthew, Mark or Luke, accompanied with all this particularity; with the opinions, language and conduct of the spectators?

There may perhaps be a few exceptions; but on the whole, the description of facts or representation of doctrines in concise and nervous language, and the vigor of the prime of life which, it is imagined, are found in this book, are not characteristics of it. Minute particularity and familiar narrative belong to advanced years; and we can say with truth that the style, like that of Isocrates in his old age, though often prolix, is agreeable.

---

<sup>1</sup> Eichhorn, Einleit. in das neue Test. II. Bd. 2d Part, § 182. p. 309.

## § 66.

As there have been errors in higher criticism in regard to the Gospel, so have there been, likewise, in regard to the Epistle. But before proceeding, let us give a faithful account of its contents.

After an introduction, which for the present we leave unnoticed, the course of thought in the Epistle is as follows. God is light; and we must strive after this light, that we may be cleansed by the blood of Jesus. He who imagines himself sinless is deceived; he who acknowledges himself a sinner may expect cleansing and reconciliation to God by Jesus Christ. We are sure that we know Jesus Christ, if we fulfil his commandments; in this way the love of God is shown in us, and we unite ourselves to Christ, according to whose example and precepts we live. Then we no longer walk in darkness, but in the light, through love (—2: 13).

I write unto you all, of every age and condition (—2: 15). Be not engrossed by the love of the world; for the world passeth away. Important things are now taking place. Enemies of Christ (the Messiah) have arisen in your midst; on which account I have written to you (—2: 21). Their heresy is, that Jesus is not the Christ, the Son of God; but remain ye steadfast in the doctrines ye have received, that ye may continue united to God and Christ, and may gain eternal life. I have written to you to preserve you from error and to lead you to Jesus (—2: 28).

The Father hath showed us love through him, that he might receive us as children, and save us by the cleansing of Christ's blood. He who lives in sin is of the kingdom of the wicked one; through love we belong to God; through the want of it to the wicked one. After having passed from death to life, we, for love of whom Jesus gave his life, ought to love one another (—3: 19).

We have assured confidence in God, and we shall be heard by him, because we are obedient to his precepts, which are love and faith in Christ. Believe not every doctrine; they who acknowledge not that Jesus is Christ come in the flesh are in error, and are of the world, and it is not fit that we should be like them (—4: 7).

Let us love one another, because God loved us and gave his Son for us, that we being reconciled might be united to God by love. This Son was Jesus, the Christ, the Saviour of the world. Through faith in him, and through love, we become united with God and with him, and gain a confidence without fear. The love of God to us should be our example in our love to our fellow-men (—5:).

In believing that Jesus is the Christ, in loving him and keeping his commandments, we are exalted above the world and its errors, since the world, in spite of all evidence, refuses to acknowledge Jesus and forfeits eternal life (—5: 14).

The consequence of our confidence in God is that he hears us; when, therefore, we see a sinful brother, whose sin is not unto death, we should pray for him. He that is born of God sinneth not; it is only the world that lieth in wickedness. We have attained to exalted knowledge, and are united to God through Christ.

It will be seen by every one from this outline, that the author, after a

few introductory sentences, treats of the doctrine that Jesus is the Christ the Son of God, and the high importance of the law of love; two subjects of very different nature. We must have this fact in view in our judgment respecting the regularity and keeping of the work, so that we may not require of it a unity which it is not reasonable to expect. It would indeed be wrong, in a didactic work written without reference to particular circumstances, to discuss two subjects so foreign to each other as these; but not so in regard to an Epistle, the tenor of which was prescribed by the requisitions made by time and place upon a man discharging the duties of his office as a teacher.

According to common custom the composition should have been divided into two sections, and one subject alone should have been treated in each; but the author followed his own peculiar method, and conducted his two subjects side by side throughout his work, so as to interweave them with each other, like two branches from different stocks, returning to each alternately, till he unites them together in his conclusion.

On account of this mode of procedure, he was obliged to recur frequently to each of the two subjects, and, as one may say if he chooses, to repeat what he had already stated, though this was done knowingly and purposely. Nor are there, in fact, any mere repetitions; but he turns his subjects so as to present them in various aspects, shows them in different relations, enforces them on different grounds. He most frequently inculcates upon his readers, that love and faith in Christ conduct to union with him and the Father, the highest object of faith and virtue, while the opposite leads men away from that object.<sup>1</sup>

By losing sight of the mode in which the two subjects are discussed alternately throughout the whole composition, we shall become unable to perceive anything but a confused jumble, without plan or connexion. This, however, can be only through our own fault; for the author, though he does not follow the common mode of discussing subjects, really pursues one more intricate.

If then, as is just, we consent to subtract something from the confusion and forgetfulness which has been ascribed to the Epistle, and something from what has been said of the power of nervous description and the marks of vigorous manhood visible in the Gospel, these two compositions will approach a level with each other, and may both have been composed in an advanced, though still far from imbecile, period of life.

### § 67.

It is as plain as anything can be, that one absorbing topic of the Epistle is the doctrine, the proof of which was John's especial object in composing his Gospel, viz. that *Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God*. It is no less certain that the Epistle exhibits numerous allusions to the Gospel, and repetitions of words and expressions contained in it. It was

<sup>1</sup> The prevalent philosophy of the period boasted that its design was to effect a union of man's nature with that of higher beings. This union was to be effected by strange means, it is true. (Introd. Part II. Chap. II. § 131 below). John aims at this point in a different way; and for this purpose makes use of the passages in the Gospel respecting being one, *ἐν εἶναι*, with God and Christ, *μένειν ἐν τῷ πατρὶ--μένειν ἐν ἡμοῖς* (14: 20. 15: 4, 7. 17: 21), repeating them in this Epistle (2: 24—23. 3: 6, 9, 24. 4: 12—16).



probably intended to accompany the latter, and to aid the impression made by it.

This constant reference of the Epistle is evident in the doctrines it presents, as, likewise, in the moral precept respecting love, concerning which all that is said in it is, in substance, taken from the Gospel. Jesus, in enjoining the law of love as evidence of Christian conduct and discipleship, called it the *new commandment*, ἐντολὴν καινὴν (13: 34. 15: 12). John, in making a transition to this commandment in the Epistle (2: 7—11), makes use of the same words to introduce it, οὐκ ἐντολὴν καινὴν γράφω ὑμῖν; for, he adds, it is already an *old commandment*, which ye had in the beginning of your christian course.

This love, he further says, is shown by observing all the commandments (5: 3. 3: 2, 24. 2: 34). The passages designated are but repetitions of our Saviour's language in the Gospel in regard to this commandment of love (14: 15, 21. 15: 9, 10).

He who does not keep these commandments belongs to the kingdom of the prince of darkness, who was a sinner from the beginning (3: 8—12). We find the same contrast in the Gospel likewise (8: 44).

The highest proof of God's love towards us (which love should be our example), consists in his having given his own Son for us (4: 9, 10). These are the words of Jesus as represented in the Gospel (3: 16).

The highest evidence of the love of Jesus towards us is, that he laid down his life for us (3: 16). "Greater love," says Jesus in the Gospel (15: 13), "hath no man than this, that a man lay down his life for his friends."

We here see that the transition, explanation, contrast and arguments, constituting the substance of what is said on the subject, are derived from the Gospel; not to mention individual expressions and allusions, which it is the commentator's province, and not ours, to point out.

### § 68.

In the essential parts of this Epistle, and in things of minor importance, we everywhere see clearly a designed reference to the Gospel. Now what kind of reference was intended by the writer?

This he has plainly indicated at the outset of his Epistle: "*That which was from the beginning, which we have heard, which we have seen with our eyes, which we have looked upon, and our hands have handled, of the word of life (for the life was manifested, and we have seen it and bear witness, and shew unto you that eternal life, which was with the Father, and was manifested unto us); that which we have seen and heard declare we unto you, that ye also may have fellowship with us: and truly our fellowship is with the Father, and with his Son Jesus Christ. And these things write we unto you. . . .*"

The principles of moral conduct which he inculcates in the Epistle could neither have been seen by him nor handled with his hands; the doctrine, moreover, that Jesus was the Christ, he may indeed have heard from our Lord's mouth, but he could never have handled it.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> In regard to the supposition that the author had reference to the Docetæ, I have expressed my opinion before, when treating of the Gospels (Note 2 to § 51).

Further, he seems particularly anxious to have his readers understand that he writes something to them, and that he has already written it; and this at the commencement of the Epistle. 1: 4, καὶ ταῦτα γράφομεν ὑμῖν. 2: 12, γράφω ὑμῖν, τέκνία. 13, γράφω ὑμῖν, πατέρες—γράφω ὑμῖν, νεανίσκοι—γράφω ὑμῖν, παιδία. 14, ἔγραψα ὑμῖν, πατέρες—ἔγραψα ὑμῖν, νεανίσκοι. 2: 21, ἔγραψα ὑμῖν. 26, ταῦτα ἔγραψα. . . . Who would aver five times, at the very outset of an Epistle, that he was writing, and four times that he had written, what he was only going to write? Had this happened once or twice only, towards the end of the Epistle, as e. g. in 5: 13, where he declares once more : ταῦτα ἔγραψα, it might pass as nothing extraordinary; but as the case actually is, it is inexplicable, except on the supposition that these declarations do not refer to the Epistle itself, but to something else.

He writes what he has heard, seen, etc. The things which John had not only heard, but seen with his eyes and handled with his hands, must have been things which fell under the cognizance of the senses mentioned; i. e. events and incidents, for which he presents himself as voucher, καὶ μαρτυροῦμεν. Now what things can be meant but those to which he testifies in his Gospel? Had we our election among several historical accounts, should we not naturally select that to which the Epistle bears perpetual reference?

But John does not let the matter rest even here; he, as it were, gives the title of the book. Respecting that which was from the beginning—the word—we inform you : ὁ ἦν ἀπ' ἀρχῆς—περὶ τοῦ λόγου—ἀπαγγέλλομεν ὑμῖν. This is exactly the introduction to the Gospel: *In the beginning was the word.* He then adds in the Epistle, of the word of life—which was with the Father and was manifested unto us : περὶ τοῦ λόγου τῆς ζωῆς—ἥτις ἦν πρὸς τὸν πατέρα, etc. So at the outset of the Gospel: *The word was life, he was with the Father, and we saw his glory.* The manner in which the ancients were accustomed to cite a work was by designating the words with which it began.<sup>1</sup>

It was concerning this, therefore, that he declared, testified, wrote, and had written, ἀπαγγέλλομεν, μαρτυροῦμεν, γράφομεν, and ἔγραψαμεν (i. e. when he composed his Epistle). He expresses himself at one time in the present tense, γράφω ὑμῖν, as we do of a composition which we send with another letter—I treat of this subject in it, or write respecting this. At others he expresses himself in the past tense (2: 14. 2: 21, 26. 5: 13), ἔγραψα ὑμῖν, because it was in reality a thing already done.

If now he refers to something already written, and in fact to his book on the Logos, it is clear what was the object of his solemn, thrice-repeated asseveration at the beginning of the Epistle, that he declares what *he had seen, heard, and handled* : ὁ ἀκηκόαμεν, ὁ ἑώρακάμεν, ὁ ἐθεασάμεθα, καὶ αἱ χεῖρες ἡμῶν ἐψηλάφησαν—καὶ ἑώρακάμεν καὶ μαρτυροῦμεν—ὁ ἑώρακάμεν καὶ ἀκηκόαμεν, ἀπαγγέλλομεν, κ. τ. λ. He avers his knowledge of those facts concerning which he had satisfied himself by all the organs of perception, and his fidelity and accuracy in

<sup>1</sup> The Jews cited thus : יְהוֹשֻׁעַ בְּנֵי נִחֵם, אֶרְכָּן. So also with the Greeks, when they desired to be accurate. Dionys. Halic. in Dinarcho. *Δημόσιοι λόγοι γνήσιοι καὶ ψευδεπίγραφοι.* Diog. Laert. in Pherec. L. I. c. 6. and 11. in Archyt. L. VIII. c. 5. § 5. in Philolao L. VIII. c. 7. § 4, etc.

describing and communicating them ; in other words his complete historic credibility as to the contents of his Gospel.<sup>1</sup> The topic is, the authority which he claims as a historian, to confirm which he intends to remind his readers of his personal connexion with the occurrences and of the weight of his testimony.

The repeated expressions : *I write*, and *I have written*, which follow soon after his asseveration of his historical fidelity, now stand in their true light. *I write unto you, little children, fathers, young men*, etc. What is this language but a dedication of his work on the Logos to every age and condition, to the whole church, to which he commits and commends it ? The expressions now cease to be idle and out of place. This dedication, likewise, contains evident allusions to the Gospel. "I have written unto you, fathers, because ye have known him that is from the beginning (ἐγγνώκατε τὸν ἀπ' ἀρχῆς). I have written unto you, young men, because ye are strong and the word of God abideth in you" (καὶ ὁ λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ ἐν ὑμῖν μένει). "I have not written unto you because ye know not the truth, but because ye know it" . . . that what ye have heard may abide with you (2: 21, 25). I have written unto you on account of those who would lead you into error (2: 26). There are probably few philological difficulties so simply and so amply explained.

In support of my position, however, I must say something respecting a requisition made of me by Bertholdt. He calls upon me to acknowledge, that if the Epistle had been sent as a supplement or accompaniment to the Gospel, it might reasonably be expected that in the copies taken of them, both would have been written together ; and that consequently the Epistle would have had its place in our canon after the Gospel of John.<sup>2</sup> This requisition serves only to embarrass, not by any means to refute, my position. It must be known to this learned man that the division and arrangement of the books have been regulated by different principles at different periods ; and that the early method came in time to be disused and forgotten. I will not repeat things so well known, but will instead state a few facts which are worthy of notice. In early times, as I shall show in the proper place, the Epistle to the Hebrews was, in the Alexandrian church, placed next after that to the Galatians, and in Upper Egypt even next after the 2d to the Corinthians. These peculiarities of early antiquity, however, are seldom met with, and only in the oldest Mss. Thus I should be completely justified in maintaining my position, even if I could not prove such an early arrangement of the books. But I am prepared to give the objector entire satisfaction on this point. The awkwardness of the copyist who wrote the Cambridge Codex has provided us with the requisite evidence of what was the ancient custom. On the first page of the leaf, on the opposite side of which the Acts of the Apostles begin (p. 657), he wrote,

<sup>1</sup> The anonymous writer in Muratori (whether Caius the Presbyter or some one else in the beginning of the third century), perceived that this was the case : " Quid ergo mirum, si Joannes tam singula etiam in Epistolis proferat, dicens de semetipso : quæ vidimus oculis nostris et auribus, et manus nostræ palpaverunt, hæc scripsimus. Sic enim non solum visorem, sed auditorem, sed et scriptorem omnium memorabilium Domini . . . se profitetur."

<sup>2</sup> Bertholdt, Hist. krit. Einleit. VI. Th. § 702. p. 3197 seq.

probably without knowing what he was about, the Latin column of the last verse of the 3d Epistle of John, and then subjoined :

Epistolæ Johannis III

explicit

incipit

Actus Apostolorum.

It is clear from this circumstance, that the copyist had an ancient Ms. before him, in which John's Epistles immediately preceded the Acts of the Apostles.

### § 69.

It would be instructive and desirable in regard to the history of the Gospel, could we determine to whom the Epistle, which was designed to accompany the former, was directed. But it contains no inscription to any one of the churches, and no salutation at the beginning, such as Paul and other writers prefixed to their letters. If, on the other hand, we investigate the accounts which have reached us respecting the Gospel, in order to discover from them the destination of the Epistle, we shall find their evidence dissimilar both in purport and in value. It is a question, in fact, where John wrote his Gospel.

Some accounts say at Patmos, others at Ephesus. Theophylact, in the Preface to his Commentaries on John, Hyppolytus the younger (as he is called), in his work on the twelve apostles, together with other writers, declare in favor of Patmos. To these are to be added numerous subscriptions to Mss., which, however, are but dubious authorities.<sup>1</sup>

The subscriptions to the Syriac version and to the Arabic one of Erpenius, testify in favor of Ephesus. With these the testimony of an eminent father, Irenæus, nearly coincides; for, though he does not expressly assign the composition of the work to this place, he does its publication, stating it to have occurred during John's residence at Ephesus.<sup>2</sup>

The account of the author of the Synopsis generally appended to the works of Athanasius, is worthy of attention. *The Gospel of John*, he says, *was composed by St. John, the apostle and beloved disciple, while living in banishment on the isle of Patmos, and was published at Ephesus by Gaius, the friend and host of the apostles, of whom Paul writes in his Epistle to the Romans: Gaius, mine host, saluteth you.*<sup>3</sup>

Nearly the same is stated by Dorotheus of Tyre, a collector who gathered things together from every quarter without judgment.<sup>4</sup> From

<sup>1</sup> Wetstein, N. T. T. I. p. 831. Matthæi, N. T. P. IV. p. 356. Birch, N. T. P. I. p. 676. Biörnstaht's Letters. Vol. VI. Part I. p. 160.

<sup>2</sup> Iren. Adv. Hær. L. III. c. 1.

<sup>3</sup> Τὸ δὲ κατὰ Ἰωάννην εὐαγγέλιον ὑπηγορεύθη τε ὑπ' αὐτοῦ τοῦ ἁγίου Ἰωάννου τοῦ ἀποστόλου καὶ ἡγαπημένου, ὅντος ἐξορίστου ἐν Πάτμῳ τῇ νήσῳ. Καὶ ἐξεδόθη ἐν Ἐφέσῳ διὰ Γαίου τοῦ ἀγαπητοῦ καὶ ξενοδόχου τῶν ἀποστόλων, περὶ οὗ καὶ Παῦλος Ῥωμαίοις γράφων ἴφρησι, ἀσπάζεται ἑμᾶς κ. τ. λ. Athan. Opp. T. II. p. 155. Venet.

<sup>4</sup> Max. Biblioth. Patr. T. III. p. 421. Lugd. 1677. The Greek text of this passage may be found in Rob. Stephens' N. Test. 1550 Fol. before the Gospel of John.



whatever source (now lost to us) this account may have been derived, it merits attention for its circumstantiality, and also because its intermediate character in a manner reconciles the two former statements.

Let us then subject it to a closer scrutiny. In investigating the facts on which it rests, we find in the first place, that the tradition of John's residence at Ephesus is sustained by valid evidence.<sup>1</sup> The other fact, his banishment to Patmos, is avouched by himself (Rev. 1: 9). But, it is said, the representation is made in a poetical work.<sup>2</sup> This is an unfounded objection, the force of which we shall consider hereafter, in our introduction to what we have to say of the Apocalypse. The fact is not at all invalidated by the objection.

These two facts imply circumstances of importance, which may be evolved from them by analysis. For in inquiring whether John really composed his work at the period of his banishment, and hence at Patmos, we shall readily see that while at Ephesus, occupied by the care of a numerous society, and with the superintendence of the churches which had sprung up in the vicinity, he must have been less able to devote his time to the labors of composition, than during his inactive banishment to a dull rock. While this lasted, withdrawn from the ordinary circle of his occupations, he could discharge the duties incumbent upon him as a teacher only by his writings. Add to this, that in his absence, heretics had an open field for the accomplishment of their objects, and that he could counteract their influence only by a written refutation; for a polemical or apologetical intention on his part, even as respects his Gospel, is asserted by the ancients, and denied by few in modern times.

But, supposing John to have written his Gospel during his banishment, an uninhabited island was certainly no place to publish it. It was necessary that it should be published in a considerable community, in which the work would come immediately to the knowledge of a great many persons, and be put in circulation by means of transcripts. Now the only means of effecting this object was to send the work to the continent, to one of the cities which contained well-known Christian churches, and in which the author had friends and acquaintances, who would undertake to promote its circulation.

In casting his eyes from Patmos upon the cities suited to his purpose, Ephesus must first have attracted his attention; the capital of Asia Minor, the parent-source of Christianity to the neighboring cities (Acts 19: 10), whose church had been founded by Paul, and watched over, fostered, and enlarged by John himself. Thus the selection was not at all difficult; or rather every consideration combined to fix it upon Ephesus.

Such are the circumstances comprised in the two facts which form the basis of the account left us by the author of the Synopsis. These circumstances derive support from their internal consistency. We can see, moreover, by their light, that the passage under consideration accords so well with the circumstances of John's later life, that it may

<sup>1</sup> Süsskind and Flatt, *Magazin für christl. Dogmatik und Moral*. 9th St. p. 57 seq. on the treatise entitled: "Der Evangelist Johannes und seine Ausleger vor dem jüngsten Gericht."

<sup>2</sup> Eichhorn, *Einl. in das N. T.* Vol. II. Part II. § 157. p. 122.

claim to be regarded as veracious tradition. I shall be able to confirm it still further, I hope, in regard to the circumstance of the publication of the Gospel by Gaius.

### § 70.

If, then, John despatched his work to the main land, it was necessary that he should send an Epistle to the church at Ephesus, for the purpose of commending and dedicating it to them. The other Evangelists, who published their works in their own places of residence, could present them to their fellow-Christians personally and orally, and consequently could dispense with a written accompaniment.

Thus an Epistle was absolutely requisite; and, as we have fully shown, the first Epistle of John is inseparable from his Gospel. Its purport is that of an accompaniment and dedication of the Gospel. It was therefore sent with the latter to Ephesus.

The following observation, will especially confirm this supposition. In the Apocalypse, John distinctly designates the characteristic faults and virtues of each of the churches in his immediate vicinity and under his superintendence. The church at Ephesus is there characterized by the following traits. There were in its midst persons who assumed ministerial and even apostolic authority, but were impostors, *ψευδοῖς*. In particular, however, he reproaches it severely with *having lost its first love*, *τὴν ἀγάπην σου τὴν πρώτην ἀφ᾽ ἧρας* (Rev. 2: 4).<sup>1</sup>

There were deceivers and false teachers in other churches. Decreasing love, however, was a peculiar trait, and a charge made by the Apostle against no other church.

He judged that the want of love was the characteristic fault of the Ephesians. Now the Epistle is filled from beginning to end with exhortations to love, statements of its importance, and reproof of such as were chargeable with the want of it (1 John 2: 5, 9, 10, 11, 15. 3: 1, 11, 12, 14—18, 23. 4: 7—10, 12, 16—21. 5: 1—3). Must we not then admit, comparing the Apostle's opinion of the Ephesians with this Epistle, that its peculiar purport suits no other church so well as theirs?<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Tertullian remarks this characteristic reproach in his work, *De pœnitentiâ*. "Evolve, quæ Spiritus ecclesiis dicat; desertam dilectionem Ephesiis imputat; stuprum et idolothyta Thyatirenis," rel.

<sup>2</sup> Augustine and some of the Latin fathers term this Epistle *ad Parthos*, which circumstance we explain as follows. The second Epistle to John is sometimes called by the ancients *Epistola ad virgines*, and consequently in Greek *πρὸς παρθένας*. Thus Clement in his *Adumbrations*, "*Secunda Joannis Epistola, quæ ad virgines scripta est, simplicissima est*" (Tom. II. Opp. Clem. Alex. p. 10, 11. Edit. Venet). There are some Greek Mss. in which the second Epistle is subscribed *πρὸς Πάρθους*; whence Whiston's conjecture (in his "*Commentary on the three Catholick Epistles of St. John*. London, 1719." p. 6) that *Πάρθους* was formed by abbreviation from *παρθένας*, receives confirmation. This subscription to the second Epistle appears also in some Mss. as its superscription. There is such a Ms. for example, in the Medicean library (Cod. Act. et Epp. Cath. Plut. IV. n. 32), as we are told by Lamy (*De erudit. apost. P. II. c. 17. p. 796*), "*Epistola autem II. Johannis*," says he, "*inscribitur πρὸς Πάρθους*." Such a Ms., too, is described by Mill (*Proleg. n. 1463*), "*Ibi Epistolæ secundæ Joannis præfixus est titulus, Ἰωάννου ἐπιστολὴ β. πρὸς Πάρθους*. (This is one of

## § 71.

## THE SECOND EPISTLE.

This is directed to a female who is not named, but merely designated by the honorable appellation *ἐκλεκτὴ κυρία*.<sup>1</sup> The two topics treated of in the first Epistle, form, likewise, the subject of this smaller letter.

John alludes again to the words of our Saviour, *ἐντολὴν καὶ ἀγαπᾷν* κ. τ. λ., as in 1 Ep. 2: 7, and enjoins love, which is to manifest itself in observance of the commandments of God. He then warns her against false teachers, who deny that Jesus has come into the world as Christ or Messiah, and interdicts intercourse with them. In conclusion, he expresses a hope of soon seeing her, and complains of his want of materials for writing.

The whole of this Epistle is a short compend of the first; or it is the first on a smaller scale. Even the phraseology is the same. His mind is yet full of his previous letter; which shows that the two were not far apart in point of time. The lady appears before his mind, as in the midst of the same circumstances and dangers as the church whose instruction and admonition had just occupied his attention. Hence her residence was probably at Ephesus.

As to the author, he certainly was not dwelling in either of the Ionian or Asiatic cities; where no want of writing-materials can be supposed to have existed. He was still in his place of exile.

The remaining circumstances alluded to were probably as follows. The sons of the *ἐκλεκτὴ κυρία* had been on a visit to John (2 Ep. 4). The sister of this matron was desirous of showing similar respect and sympathy for the apostle's lot, and sent her sons, likewise, to visit him. While the latter were with the apostle, he had opportunity to despatch the two Epistles and the Gospel to the continent (v. 13).

---

the Huntingdon Mss., in Wetstein Acts n. 30). Now as this inscription to a barbarous people was not very well suited to an Epistle directed to a Greek lady, the inscription to the second Epistle was turned into a subscription to the first, whence it happens that the Latin fathers call it *epistola ad Parthos*. From an incorrect division of the words, probably, arose the reading *προ-σπαρθους*; and then by correction, *πρὸς σπάρθους*. The superscription *ad Spartos*, is prefixed to the first Epistle of John in a Latin Bible from the library at Geneva, which one of the bishops of that city, in the 11th century, presented to the church of St. Peter.

1 Critics are not agreed whether this female was named Eclecta, or *Κυρία*, or whether we should translate *electa domina*, as Jerome does. (Catal. Script. Eccl. v. Johannes). She cannot have been named Eclecta; for in that case she must have had the same name as her sister (2 Ep. v. 15). In regard to Bengel's observation in his Gnomon: "Neque dubitare quisquam potest, nisi qui stilum veterem ignorat, aut non recordatur appellativum *κυρία*, domina, extra relationem ad servos, eo tempore vix reginæ sine invidiâ dari poterat," we observe that Epictetus declares the contrary: *αἱ γυναῖκες εὐθὺς ἀπὸ τεσσάρων καὶ δέκα ἐτῶν ὑπο τῶν ἀνδρῶν κυραὶ καλοῦνται* (Enchir. c. 62).]

## § 72.

## THE THIRD EPISTLE.

This is written to Gaius. The author, as in the preceding Epistle, consoles himself with the hope of soon coming himself (v. 14). He still suffers the same want of writing-materials (v. 13). Consequently he was still in the same wretched abode; and, to judge from the expression of his hopes, the time was nearly the same as when the preceding letter was written.

The residence of Gaius is determined by the following circumstances. The most general is, what is said of the danger of his being led away from the faith (v. 3, 4). A more definite circumstance is, that John had sometimes despatched messengers thither and received accounts from thence (v. 5—8); and likewise that he regards his testimony as so well known and fully acknowledged in the community, that he could appeal to their judgment respecting its correctness (v. 12), *οἶδατε ὅτι ἡ μαρτυρία ἡμῶν ἀληθὴς ἐστι*; and, finally, that he had several intimate friends in its midst (v. 14). All this shows the place to have been a considerable one, where the apostle had resided for a long time, and, as the time was the latter period of his life, we are referred particularly to Ephesus.

He had not long before written to the church of which Gaius was a member, *ἔγραψα τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ* (v. 9). This must allude to his 1st Epistle, for we have no knowledge of another to any church; and hence Ephesus was certainly the destination of the third Epistle and the residence of Gaius.

The rest is now easily explained. John had sent thither his first Epistle, i. e. the accompaniment of the Gospel, together with the Gospel itself. But the enemies of John, with Diotrephes at their head, rejected the message and messengers of John, and even forbade others to receive them (v. 9, 10). Gaius was not influenced by this circumstance, but practised Christian hospitality and maintained his fidelity to the apostle (v. 6, 7, 8).

Who, now, was better fitted to make known John's Gospel among his fellow-Christians, and to publish it at Ephesus, if it were to be thus published, than Gaius? It is to him that the author of the Synopsis has ascribed this honor: *καὶ ἐξεδόθη ἐν' Ἐφέσῳ διὰ Γαίου*. With this statement all parts of the Epistle, not only are perfectly consistent (it is not so with unfounded accounts, for in their case the contrary rather is evident), but so accord that they mutually explain and confirm each other. And supposing that the writer of the Synopsis, or his authority, did add to the tradition a conjecture that it was the Gaius of whom Paul speaks (Rom. 16: 23), the general credit of the account is not shaken. In fact it is not impossible that Gaius changed his residence, and at a later period abode in Ephesus.



## § 73.

We are now for the first time, prepared to answer the question, When was the Gospel of John published?

Destruction had already done its work in the environs of Jerusalem, when he was employed in its composition. He often speaks of places and things in the environs as if they were no longer in existence. Thus we see from his narrative that the gardens on the Mount of Olives, which our Lord was accustomed to visit, were no more. *There was* there a garden, says he, ἦν κήπος (18: 1); and *there was* a garden in the place where Jesus was crucified (19: 41). Bethany was no longer in existence, as he says: "Bethany *was* nigh unto Jerusalem, about fifteen furlongs off" (11: 18).

He expresses himself only once as though the object of which he was speaking was still in existence, viz. respecting the pool of Bethesda; ἐστὶν ἐν τοῖς Ἱεροσολύμοις (v. 2), there *is* at Jerusalem a pool. But this existed after the destruction of Jerusalem, and long attracted men's attention, from the peculiar swelling of its springs, and the colour of its water, caused by the mineral substances it contained.<sup>1</sup> Hence the pool was open after the destruction of the city. It is true that he says of the structure over the pool, πέντε στοὰς ἔχουσα; but we know that ἔχουσα may have the signification of the imperfect tense: which *had* five porches.

But these circumstances do not determine the time with precision. If, however, the Epistles really have the close connexion with the Gospel which we have supposed, we may approach very near a definite determination of the time. In the Epistles the apostle expresses hopes of return, and looks forward with confidence to the termination of his exile, and to the satisfaction of conversing with his friends face to face. In the third Epistle he even promises himself that this shall speedily be the case, ἐλπίζω εὐθέως ἰδεῖν σε (3 Ep. 14. comp. 2: 12).

The terrible period of Domitian's reign was therefore at an end, and the milder rule of Cocceius Nerva had commenced, who set at liberty all who had been condemned on account of their religion, gave permission to those who had been exiled to return to their homes and friends, and forbade accusations of impiety and a Jewish mode of life.<sup>2</sup> This happened at the commencement of his reign, and secured the speedy return of the apostle. Now as these prospects and expectations are clearly expressed in his Epistles, which were all written about the time of the publication of his Gospel, this publication must have taken place in the first year of Nerva, i. e. in the 65th year after Jesus' death; and, supposing John to have been 19 years old at the time of the latter

1 Euseb. Onomast. de locis sacr. v. Βηζάθου. Βη"άθου, κολυμβήθρα ἐν Ἱερουσαλήμ, ἥτις ἐστὶν ἡ προβατική, τὸ παλαιὸν πέντε στοὰς ἔχουσα. Καὶ νῦν δείκνυται ἐν ταῖς αὐτοῖσι λίμναις διδύμοις, ὧν ἑκάτερα μὲν ἐκ τῶν κατ' ἔτος ὑετῶν πληροῦνται, θάτερα δὲ παραδόξως πεφοινγμένον δείκνυσσι τὸ ὕδωρ, κ. τ. λ.

2 Dio. Cass. Epit. Xiphilin. in Nerv. p. 241. Ed. Henr. Stephan. 8. Ed. Wechel. p. 769. Καὶ ὁ Νερῶνας τοὺς τε κοινομένους ἐπ' ἀσεβείᾳ ἀφῆκε, καὶ τοὺς φεύγοντας κατήγαγε . . . τοῖς δὲ δὴ ἄλλοις οὐτ' ἀσεβείας, οὐτ' Ἰουδαϊκοῦ βίου καταιτιᾶσθαι τινὰς ἀνεχώρησε.

occurrence, in the 84th year of his life, about 31 years after the publication of Matthew.

But how was John able, after such a number of years, to recall with accuracy so many discourses and occurrences, with their numerous peculiarities and *minutiæ*, as detailed in his history? There is probably no one who will not be led to ask himself this question. But who will presume to say that John did not note down anything before writing his history? that after the consummation of these events, when he had learned their importance from the surprising consequences which ensued, he did not think fit to note down anything to aid his memory in after times? Who will endeavor to persuade us, that when he perceived his recollection of the words and actions of his Master to be gradually growing more and more feeble in the lapse of time, he took no precaution to secure them by permanent means?

If it be asked still further, when, at what period of his life, he began to note down anything in writing, it must be replied that the interrogator pushes his curiosity further than it can be satisfied; not merely in regard to John, but most ancient historians, who have written of the events of their time. Who can tell when Xenophon commenced his earliest notes towards the composition of his Hellenic History, or Tacitus towards his *Libri Historiarum*? Yet the former executed his history 49 years, and the latter at least 30, after the commencement of the series of occurrences which he narrates. The assumption which we make in regard to them, viz. that they did what was necessary to retain possession of the facts which became known to them from their own observation or through eye-witnesses, we must acknowledge to be allowable in this case.

## SUPPLEMENT

RESPECTING SOME DISPUTED PORTIONS OF THE GOSPELS.

### § 74.

#### *Of the first two chapters of Matthew.*

The authenticity of the first two chapters of Matthew was attacked almost at the same time in England and Germany, and has found supporters in both nations. With an aim in view totally different from that of his predecessors, a man of established reputation for learning, has pronounced the narratives of Matthew and Luke to be irreconcilable with each other, as respects those portions which relate to the birth and early life of Jesus.<sup>1</sup> We cannot, in an introduction, avoid noticing a question which involves so considerable a portion of the Evangelical history.

The principal objections which have been advanced against these two chapters, may be comprised under the following heads.

I. The genealogy in Luke plainly contradicts that in Matthew.

II. The annunciation related in Luke (1: 26—38) does not agree with Matthew's account (1: 18—22).

III. The succession and connexion of facts in the history of Jesus' youth in Luke, leave no space for the visit of the Magi and the flight to Egypt; but make these events chronologically impossible.

IV. The story of the Magi in Matthew bears evident marks of fiction. The motion of a star before a party of men, to point out to them their way, and its standing still above a house, are phenomena not compatible with any astronomical system.

V. The murder of the children in Bethlehem confutes itself by its internal improbability; and other things in which Matthew varies from Luke want verisimilitude.

VI. Lastly, these two chapters are nowhere cited in the oldest fathers; and in some Mss. Matthew's genealogy is wanting.

As to the first point, it cannot be denied that the contrariety of the genealogies has not yet been explained. The evasion that one traces Joseph's descent, and the other (Luke 3: 23), Mary's, does violence to the phraseology employed. Let us, however, examine the matter more closely.

---

<sup>1</sup> "Über die Schriften des Lukas, ein kritischer Versuch," by Dr. Fr. Schleiermacher. I. Th. Berlin 1817. p. 42—50.

In both genealogies, we find the names Salathiel and Zerubabel ; in each, Salathiel is the father and Zerubabel the son, and both are of the royal house of David. This coincidence of personal circumstances seems to denote that the persons in the two genealogies are identical. The time, too, at which they lived, confirms this supposition.

The names of Salathiel and Zerubabel occur in Matthew during and directly after the exile. So too in Luke, as appears from what follows. There were five hundred and a few more years from David's reign to the first return of the Jewish tribes from exile ; and from that event till the time of Christ there were again five hundred and a few more years ; consequently these two periods of time are equal. Luke reckons back to Salathiel 21 generations, and from Salathiel to David the same number ; as Matthew reckons two periods of 14 generations each, corresponding with the two periods above-mentioned. After the first 21 generations in Luke, five centuries after David's time, i. e. at a period during and after the exile, occur the names of Salathiel and Zerubabel. Thus not only their personal circumstances, but the time when they both lived, leads us to the conclusion that the same persons are intended in both genealogies.

The question now arises : Can Salathiel be the son of Jechonias, as represented in Matthew, and at the same time the son of Neri and Melchi, as represented in Luke ?

Jechonias was not so fortunate as to have any children. Jechonias, or Jehoiachin (two names of the same person as is well known ; see 2 Kings 24: 6 seq. 1 Chron. 3: 16), was carried prisoner to Babylon. At that time he had no children ; for the 2d book of Kings (24: 15), which enumerates his family, mentions only his mother, wives, and officers.

During his exile his royal rank made his fate more severe than that of common Jews. The latter enjoyed at least a degree of liberty, as planters and laborers ; but the king was guarded in prison. He continued in prison till Evilmerodach, in the 37th year of his captivity, liberated him, changed his prison-garments, and placed him at his own table (2 Kings 25: 27). When he went to Babylon he was 18 years of age, and consequently 55 at his release ; an age when the expectation of children must have ceased with one so depressed and debilitated by adversity. Moreover Jeremiah uttered a prophecy (22: 30), by which he was cut off from the privilege of offspring.

Hence, if he had children, they must have been his nominal children, according to the law which required a man to raise up seed unto his brother. In this way Salathiel may have been a son of Jechonias, as he is said to have been in Matthew, and still a son of Melchi and Neri, as in Luke.

But it will be objected, the first book of Chronicles (3: 17, 18), enumerates several sons of his ; which renders improbable the supposition we have made ; for only the first son was begotten for one who died childless, and he alone named after him, the others belonging to their natural father.

Let us then examine the passage in the Chronicles. It reads : "The sons of Jechoniah, Assir ; Shealtiel his son, Malchiram also, and Pedaiah, and Shenazar," etc. But Assir is not here a proper name ; אַסִּיר, or אֶסֶר, signifies *one bound, one kept in prison*. Now it was the distin-



guishing characteristic of the unfortunate king's fate, that he spent the greater part of his life in captivity. The expression בְּנָי, too, shows that only one son is spoken of; and the first clause of the passage should be translated : *the sons of Jechoniah, the imprisoned, are Shealtiel his son, etc.*

The second clause of the passage : *Malchiram also, and Pedaiah, and Shenazar, etc.* וּשְׁנָאֶזָר וּפְדַיָּה וּמַלְכִירָם, is wrongly translated. Among the ancestors of Salathiel, in Luke, Melchi stands as grandfather, and Neri as father. The first name may be made out in this passage, by dividing the words thus : מַלְכִירָם וְרִמּוֹ-פְדַיָּה ; and then the passage signifies : *And Melchi raised up to him* (רָמָה, ἔβαλε, for ἐπέβαλεν, or ἐν-ποίησεν, αὐτῷ) *Pedaiah, Shenazar etc.* Thus Luke's account is confirmed ; for it is of no consequence, in a Jewish genealogy, that the grandfather is put instead of the father, Neri, inasmuch as one link is frequently omitted, as several are in Matthew. Besides, Neri may have been prematurely called away by death from the duties of a father, in which case all the children fell to Melchi's family.

Thus the book of Chronicles plainly states the circumstance, that, for the preservation of the royal line and the assurance of posterity, the sons that were subsequently born of one of the king's wives, were reckoned to the king's race.

Hence Salathiel occurs with propriety in both genealogical tables. The two lines are those of Nathan and Solomon. We will state the reason why Salathiel might be reckoned in both. We find no mention in the Old Testament of any brothers of Jechoniah who lived to man's estate ; the sons of Zedekiah, his father's brother, were murdered before the eyes of their parent, and he himself deprived of sight ; Shal-lum, another of his father's brothers, had long been carried away captive to Egypt, and one branch after another of the house of Solomon was destroyed. In default of near kinsmen, more distant relations supplied their place.<sup>1</sup> The nearest royal line to Solomon's was that of Nathan. Solomon and Nathan were even brothers on the mother's side ; and therefore in the enumeration of David's children they are always connected together (2 Sam. 5: 14. 1 Chron. 3: 5). Hence Salathiel appears as son both in the table of Nathan's line in Luke, and that of Solomon's in Matthew.

Let us now inquire respecting Zerubabel, Salathiel's son. In 1 Chron. 3: 17, 18, 19, Shealtiel, the son of Jechoniah, has no son ; in Matthew he has one, viz. Zerubabel. But the means of solving the difficulty present themselves in the passage itself. Shealtiel was childless ; Pedaiah was his eldest brother, whose duty it was to raise up seed to Shealtiel ; among Pedaiah's sons we find Zerubabel, who, if Pedaiah fulfilled the law, may have been reckoned as the son of Shealtiel.

Further, we perceive that in both tables Zerubabel is represented as having sons.

Josia.	Melchi.
Jechonia.	Neri.
Shealtiel	
Zerubabel	
Abiud.	Resa.

<sup>1</sup> Michaelis, *Mosaisches Recht*, Vol. II. § 98.

Now, if what has been said of Shealtiel is well-founded, we can explain this circumstance in regard to Zerubabel. He might properly stand as father in both lines, that of Solomon and that of Nathan. He belonged to the first as Shealtiel's son; and he no doubt became a father in the other according to the requirement of the Mosaic law, as he himself was begotten.<sup>1</sup>

From this point the two lines run on uninterruptedly about 500 years, to Joseph, the father of our Lord. Now is it anything strange or incredible, that after so long a period a case should again occur (for cases of this kind were by no means rare, see Matth. 22: 25 seq.), in which one family was bound by the requisition of the law to preserve the failing stock of the other? Examine our ancient genealogical registers, and see how few families have lasted in a right line for so long a period of time.

It is a fact, that we do not find mentioned in the New Testament, or in history, any brothers of Joseph, or any kinsmen of Jesus on the father's side. He stands alone, as must have been the case were he a descendant of an extinguished stock, begotten in accordance with the requisition of the law.

Thus only three cases of this nature are requisite in a period of a thousand years to render the two tables perfectly consistent according to Jewish usage. And does not the chief difficulty fall in the most calamitous days of the Jewish state, the most unfortunate times of the house of Solomon, when we may suppose every means would be taken for the preservation of the race? Do not historic facts establish a part of our theory, and Jewish law and usage favor the whole?

Thus, the genealogy of Luke does not contradict that of Matthew. Luke presents us a document, which though inferior in value to Matthew's, was yet from its novelty, and because it deduced the same result in another way, worthy of record.

But there is still a difficulty in reconciling these tables, which must be removed. The name *Ἀβιούδ*, which we find in Matthew, does not appear in the enumeration of Zerubabel's sons in 1 Chron. 3: 19. The explanation of this, as I imagine, is contained in the name itself. Names beginning with *Abi*, and in Arabic with *Abu*, are not always proper names. In Arabic they are generally names assumed from affection for a son. Thus Mohammed called himself, from Kasem his son, *Abu-kasem*, the father of *Kasem* (*Abulfeda, Annal. Muslem.* T. I. p. 192, 193). Analogous examples occur among the Jews. One of David's

<sup>1</sup> My friend and former pupil, Prof. Herbst, of Tübingen, has kindly communicated to me an attempt to reconcile the two accounts in a simpler way. He thinks that the division מלכ-רמז, and particularly the interpretation of רמז, as meaning *ἐμβάλλειν, ἐμποίειν*, are forced. He considers Assir, אַסִּיר, to be a proper name, which, as cannot be denied, frequently occurs in genealogical tables. On this supposition, he is of opinion that *Assir* was raised up by a kinsman of the line of Nathan to Jechoniah who was childless, and that Assir's sons were Salathiel, Malchiram, Pedaiah, etc. The use of the plural number, בְּנֵי יְהוֹנָדָה אַסִּיר, (1 Chron. 3: 16), is no objection. It is used with reference to children of the second and third generation, as in 1 Chron. 6: 7. בְּנֵי קָהָת עֲמִינָדָב בְּנוֹ קָהָת בְּנוֹ אַסִּיר. The annexed ו in בְּנוֹ refers back, as in the example adduced, to Assir אַסִּיר. The rest then proceeds as I have supposed. That Assir is not mentioned in Matthew's table, is a circumstance common to him with many others, who are omitted on account of the division into classes of fourteen generations each. I give the preference to this simple mode of reconciliation.

valiant men was named Abiel, *God my Father* (1 Chron. 11: 32), and is likewise called Abialbon, Albon's father (2 Sam. 23: 31). The father-in-law of Abia is called Uriel (2 Chron. 13: 2), and likewise Abishalom, Shalom's father (1 Kings 15: 2). The case may be the same as to the word Abiud; it is a name expressive of a father's affection. The proper name may have been Meshullam, or Hanania, etc.

II. The objection of Schleiermacher: "If Luke's account of the annunciation be correct, the doubts of Joseph and their removal as stated in Matthew are not supposable" etc.,<sup>1</sup> is rather surprising than important. The doubts of Joseph were not removed by the annunciation. If Mary informed him of her pregnancy by relating this occurrence, through which she herself first obtained knowledge of it, her statement needed unusual confirmation, just in proportion as the circumstances deviated from the common course of nature. An extraordinary mode of convincing Joseph was therefore requisite; and hence the account in Matth. 1: 20—22, is not only not inconsistent with Luke's, but rather assists and completes it. Joseph's mind must have been put at rest, and Mary must have been secure as respected the measures he might have taken, before she could undertake the journey to Elizabeth for the purpose of seeing the sign which the angel had given her in confirmation. It is not to be supposed that the journey was made without Joseph's concurrence; and hence the indifference towards her husband, which, it is said, an absence of three months evinced, is done away. In fact, the absence was probably wished by Joseph; for, after taking her to wife, he knew her not till she had brought forth her first-born son (Matth. 1: 24, 26).

III. The discrepancies between the two Evangelists are said to extend still further into the history of Jesus' youth. Luke says (2: 22 and 39), that when the days of the purification of the mother of Jesus were over, his parents went to Jerusalem, to present the child to the Lord; and that, after doing everything in conformity with the law of the Lord, they returned into Galilee to their own city, Nazareth.

Matthew gives us a totally different account. The parents and the child receive a visit at Bethlehem from some Magi, which occasions their flight into Egypt, and it is not till their return that they go to Nazareth.

Now if the visit of the wise men occurred after the presentation of Jesus in the temple, the child would not then have been found by them in Bethlehem, but in Nazareth of Galilee, whither he was carried, according to Luke, immediately after this observance of the law.

On the other hand, if the Magi arrived before the presentation, the latter could never have occurred, for the flight to Egypt directly followed their visit.

The supposition that the parents returned from Egypt with Jesus to Bethlehem, again to present him to the Lord, is contradicted by Luke, who places the presentation after the forty days of Mary's purification; as also by Matthew, who asserts that on their return to Egypt they were afraid to go to Judea (2: 22).

---

<sup>1</sup> Ueber die Schriften des Lukas. I. Th. p. 42.

This difficulty, which has been much insisted on by Stroth,<sup>1</sup> is certainly very plausible.

It is an inquiry of importance, whether Luke's language is to be taken in its strictest signification; whether it must be understood as meaning that immediately after the ceremony of the presentation the parents of Jesus went to Nazareth. I do not think we are to take Luke's language in so strict a sense. Throughout the commencement of his history, he is in the habit of separating each particular narrative from the rest by some concluding formula, appending a general clause, or, as is often the case, a superfluous remark, which would be understood of itself. Such a superfluous conclusion occurs in Luke 1: 38—*Καὶ ἀπήλθεν ἀπ' αὐτῆς ὁ ἄγγελος*; and in 2: 20—*Καὶ ὑπέστρεψαν οἱ ποιμένες*, etc. So too the general remark, 1: 80—*Τὸ δὲ παιδίον ἠῤῥξανε καὶ ἐκραταιοῦτο πνεύματι*; and 2: 52—*Καὶ Ἰησοῦς προέκοπτε σοφία καὶ ἡλικία καὶ χάριτι*. Such a conclusion, too, is the clause in question; and it must be considered rather in this light, than as a definite statement of time. The words, therefore, in 2: 29—*Καὶ ὡς ἐτέλεσαν ἅπαντα . . . ὑπέστρεψαν . . . τὸ δὲ παιδίον*, denote only, in general, that after this observance of the law Jesus became an inhabitant of Nazareth, without meaning that no time elapsed between the fulfilment of the law and the residence at Nazareth, or that there were not intervening occurrences of importance.

IV. But the story concerning these Magi, it is said, is replete with absurdities. What are we to think of such astronomical phenomena as the gradual progress of a star before the travellers, its resting eventually above a particular house, etc.?

Let us examine the matter. Certain Magi came from the east, *ἐξ ἀνατολῆς*. The countries which could be called eastern in Palestine, were Arabia Deserta, Mesopotamia, and Babylonia. Babylonia was the chief seat of the science of astronomy; as, likewise, of astrology, or the art of inquiring and predicting the fate of men from the stars. It was in this country, then, that the significant star was observed.

The Magi were originally learned Persians, who were transferred to Babylon when it became the capital of the Persian kings. Subsequently, however, the term Magian was applied to astrologers and soothsayers generally. The star announced to them the birth of a great king of super-human nature, and they sought to pay him homage and adore him.<sup>2</sup>

The star which they believed to denote this event went before them, as our version reads. But does not *προάγειν* mean, likewise, to lead any one, to be his guide? And is it not customary in the East to journey by the stars at night, on account of the heat of the day?<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Repertorium für bibl. und morgenl. Litteratur. IXth Band.

<sup>2</sup> "Ideo Magi qui forte Athenis erant, immolaverunt defuncto (Platoni), amplioris fuisse sortis quam humanæ rati." Senec. Ep. 58.

<sup>3</sup> Breitenbach ('Wallfahrt zum heil. Land'), on the route to Mt. Sinai and the convent of St. Catherine, followed a star, which rose constantly after midnight, as he doubted not, on account of the merits of St. Catherine (1483, 20th Sept.). John Wehrli Zimmer followed this star ('Wallfahrt zum heil. Grab.' 1483, 22d Sept.); as, likewise, John Tucher von Nürnberg ('Verzeichniss der Reiss zum heil. Grab und nach Sinai' 4th Oct. 1480). The star of St. Catherine stands over Mt. Sinai.



The star, then, was their guide till it stood over where the young child was. Inconceivable; that a star should stand directly over a house. True; but it is only said that *it stood over where the young child was*, ἐπάνω οὗ ἦν τὸ παιδίον. This may mean over the region, as well as over the house.

This is the meaning of the account, moreover, if we interpret it according to the ideas of the time, and the astrological system of these wise men. Every man, said they, is born under a certain star, called his star: εἶδομεν τὸν ἀστέρα αὐτοῦ.

The signs of the zodiac, from east to west, and twenty-four other stars towards the north and south, occasion a peculiar temperature of the atmosphere. By the removal or approach of the planets to these stars, the atmosphere experiences important changes; and its condition at the moment when a child is conceived, animated, or born, is decisive of its destiny. It determines his talents, virtues and greatness, his actions and success.

As the fate of individuals is determined by their particular star, so whole nations are under the direction and superintendence of the constellation beneath which their country is situated; and the changes occasioned in it by the planets determine their prosperity or adversity.<sup>(1)</sup> Thus the Jewish king was seen in the constellation of his country as its benefactor.

Now if it were only known to what people a certain constellation belonged, in the vicinity of which the royal star appeared, they could by its means, according to their system, discover the nation and king which were unknown and were represented by the star. The star was their natural conductor.

It is clear from the narrative, that it was so indefinite a guide as not to point out any particular house or place, but only the country in general. Else why was it necessary for them to inquire after reaching the country: Where is he that is born king of the Jews (2: 2)?

When they had discovered where the child was, the star which had been in their view on their journey stood above where the child lay; i. e. it was above the region of the earth to which this good fortune fell, and not above any particular house. Yet the sight of the star must have

<sup>1</sup> Cicero has explained their system in his treatise *De Divinat.*, L.II. c. 42. p. 277. Bipont. Manilius, however, has discussed the astrological theory of the Chaldeans at most length, and we will here quote a passage from him in support of what we have stated.

"Hos erit in fines orbis, pontusque notandus,  
Quem Deus in partis, et singula dividit astra,  
Ac sua cuique dedit tutelæ regna per orbem  
Et proprias gentis, atque urbis addidit altas,  
In quibus efferrent præstantis sidera vires.  
Sic divisa manet tellus per secula cuncta;  
E quibus in proprias partis sunt jura trahenda.  
Namque eadem quæ sunt signis commercia servant,  
Vtque illa inter se coeunt, odioque repugnant,  
Nunc adversa polo, nunc et conjuncta trigono,  
Quæque alia in varios affectus causa gubernat,  
Sic erit et sedes fugienda, petenda cuique,  
Sic speranda fides; sic et metuenda pericla," etc.

[*Astronom. L. IV. v. 697 seq.*]

filled them with all the joy represented by Matthew, inasmuch as it was a token of the correctness of their discovery, and a confirmation of the truth of the accounts they had received, as well as of their system (2: 10).

V. The murder of the children at Bethlehem, it is objected, even supposing the most savage barbarity on the part of Herod, is inexplicable. For, how much more cheaply he might have obtained his end? How easy it must have been for him to discover, in so small a place as Bethlehem, the spot to which the strangers carried their costly gifts, etc.<sup>1</sup> There is force in these remarks, if we take into account nothing but his cruelty. This, however, was mostly the effect of his distrustful temper, which increased with his years and reached its highest pitch in the latter period of his life.<sup>2</sup> Now he had just been imposed upon in regard to the child by the Magi, and wounded in a sensitive part, so that to represent him as depending any further on inquiries, would be an improbable statement. He acted, therefore, in conformity with his disposition; he was cruel from distrust.

Matthew, it is said further, differs from Luke in regard to Joseph's dwelling place. He does not seem to know that Galilee was his home, and that he prolonged his stay in Judea only from accident, because Mary was delivered there. He rather supposes Joseph to have been an inhabitant of Judea; and thus, when Joseph leaves Egypt to go home, he travels towards Judea, and does not turn towards Galilee till he is warned of God in a dream. But is Matthew so totally wrong? We should reverse the matter. It would rather seem that Joseph resided casually in Galilee, inasmuch as, on account of his relationship and descent, he was cited to Judea, εἰς τὴν ἰδίαν πόλιν, that his name might appear in the register of the place.<sup>3</sup> This statement of Luke clearly confirms Matthew's representation. A good reason may be assigned, why Joseph feared Archelaus. This prince had done at the outset of his government what Herod had never done, and what had never yet happened; he had caused several thousand people to be massacred in the temple on the feast of the passover, because of some seditious proceedings (*Jos. Ant. L. XVII. c. 9. n. 3. De Bell. Jud. L. II. c. 1. n. 3*). The cruel act must have seemed the more horrible to Joseph, when he reached the land of Israel, as it had just happened, and still filled all minds with consternation.

V. It is objected, lastly, that some Mss. do not contain this genealogy, and the most ancient fathers appear to know nothing about these chapters of Matthew.

Velthusen, however, has denied the fact as respects the Irrian Ms., which has been appealed to;<sup>4</sup> and in the Harleian Ms. in uncial char-

<sup>1</sup> Dr. Fr. Schleiermacher, Ueber die Schriften des Lukas. I. Th. p. 44, 45.

<sup>2</sup> *Jos. Ant. L. XVI. c., 7. n. 3.* Ἐνακοῦτο δὲ ταῖς ὑποψίαις, καὶ χεῖρων ἀεὶ γνώμενος, ἅπασιν κατὰ πάντων ἐπίστευεν. *Ant. L. XVI. c. 8. n. 2. n. 5.*

<sup>3</sup> A friend objects that if Bethlehem was his home, it is unaccountable that he had no habitation there, and was obliged to place the infant in a manger. The fact that he had no house there, is no objection to his being a native Bethlehemite, but may have been a reason why he tried his fortune in another part of the country.

<sup>4</sup> "The authenticity of the first and second chapters of Matthew's Gospel vindicated." Lond. 1771. p. 5.

acters, assigned by Griesbach to the 6th or 7th century, the addition to which so much importance has been attached (viz. the words: *Genealogia hucusque. Incipit Evangelium secundum Matthæum*), is not by the first but a later hand, and only in the margin.<sup>1</sup>

The Ebnerian Ms. at Nürnberg is, therefore, the only one on which the opponents of these chapters can rely, and in regard to this, as in regard to the Harleian Ms., a closer examination would probably alter the state of the case. [Since the first edition of this work, such an examination has been undertaken. Dr. Gabler paid due attention to the doubt I have here expressed, and disclosed the mistake in regard to this Ms. The result is as follows, in his own words (*Journ. für theol. Litt.* II. Bd. I St. 1801): "This collation is therefore decisive of the fact that the Ebnerian Ms. of the New Testament contains the first chapter of Matthew."]

Of the same character are the arguments founded on the silence of the fathers. It is possible that Ignatius Martyr derived the account he presents respecting the star, etc., from a tradition; but, notwithstanding what is said by Stroth, we cannot admit that Justin drew his relation of the occurrence from any other source than Matthew.

The whole history contained in the first two chapters of Matthew is related by Justin in his *Dial. cum Tryph.* (p. 86, 87, Rob. Steph. cap. 78). The narrative is free, but still bears evident marks of having come from Matthew.

#### Matthew.

Ἰδοὺ, μάγοι ἀπὸ ἀνατολῶν  
παρεγένοντο  
εἰς Ἱερουσόλυμα,  
λέγοντες·  
Ποῦ ἐστὶν ὁ τεχθεὶς βασιλεὺς  
τῶν Ἰουδαίων;  
εἶδομεν γὰρ αὐτοῦ  
τὸν ἀστέρα ἐν τῇ ἀνατολῇ,  
καὶ ἦλθομεν  
προσκυνῆσαι αὐτῷ . . .  
Καὶ συναγαγὼν πάντας τοὺς  
ἀρχιερεῖς . . . Οἱ δὲ εἶπον αὐτῷ . . .  
Οὕτω γέγραπται διὰ τοῦ  
προφήτου·  
"Καὶ σὺ Βηθλεὲμ, γῆ Ἰούδα,  
οὐδαμῶς ἐλαχίστη εἶ ἐν τοῖς  
ἡγεμόσιν Ἰούδα· ἐκ σοῦ γὰρ  
ἐξελεύσεται ἡγοῦμενος, ὅστις  
ποιμανεῖ τὸν λαόν μου,  
τὸν Ἰσραὴλ."

#### Justin.

Ἐλθόντων ἀπὸ Ἀραβίας μάγων,  
καὶ εἰπόντων·  
Ἐξ ἀστέρος τοῦ ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ  
φανέντος ἐγνωκέναι  
ὅτι βασιλεὺς  
γεγέννηται ἐν τῇ χώρᾳ ὑμῶν,  
καὶ ἦλθομεν  
προσκυνῆσαι αὐτόν.  
Καὶ ἐν Βηθλεὲμ τῶν πρεσβυτέρων  
εἰπόντων·  
"Οὐ γέγραπται ἐν τῷ  
προφητῇ οὕτως·  
"Καὶ σὺ Βηθλεὲμ, γῆ Ἰούδα,  
οὐδαμῶς ἐλαχίστη εἶ ἐν τοῖς  
ἡγεμόσιν Ἰούδα· ἐκ σοῦ γὰρ  
ἐξελεύσεται ἡγοῦμενος, ὅστις  
ποιμανεῖ τὸν λαόν μου."

Now how happens it (waiving every other consideration), that Justin in his narrative adduces from the Old Testament the same text which

<sup>1</sup> Griesbach, *Symb. Crit.* T. I. p. 309.

Matthew applies; that he does not take it from the Septuagint, as is his custom in regard to citations from the Old Testament; that he cites it with the same variations from the Septuagint as Matthew; and translated it from the Hebrew with the same variations, literally, as we find in Matthew? e. g. that in his memory, as in Matthew's,  $\text{לֵב יִיְהוָה}$  should have been substituted for  $\text{לֵב יִיְהוָה}$ ? etc. etc.

## Matthew.

Καὶ ἔλθόντες εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν,  
 . . . . .  
 καὶ πεσόντες προσεκύνησαν  
 αὐτῷ, καὶ ἀνοίξαντες τοὺς  
 θησαυροὺς αὐτῶν,  
 προσήνεγκαν αὐτῷ  
 δῶρα, χρυσὸν καὶ  
 λίβανον καὶ σμύρναν.  
 Καὶ χρηματισθέντες καὶ ὄναρ,  
 μὴ ἀνακάμψαι . . .  
 δι' ἄλλης ὁδοῦ  
 ἀνεχώρησαν  
 εἰς τὴν χώραν αὐτῶν . . . .  
 Καὶ ἀποστείλας ἀνείλε πάντας  
 τοὺς παῖδας  
 τοὺς ἐν Βηθλεὲμ . . .  
 Τότε ἐπληρώθη τὸ ῥηθὲν  
 ὑπὸ Ἱερεμίου τοῦ προφήτου,  
 λέγοντος·  
 “Φωνὴ ἐν Ῥαμᾷ ἠκούσθη, . . .  
 κλαυθμὸς καὶ ὀδυρμὸς πολὺς·  
 Ῥαχὴλ κλαίουσα τὰ τέκνα αὐτῆς·  
 καὶ οὐκ ἤθελε παρακληθῆναι,  
 ὅτι οὐκ εἰσι.”

## Justin.

Τῶν δὲ ἀπὸ Ἀραβίας μάγων  
 ἔλθόντων εἰς Βηθλεὲμ,  
 καὶ προσκυνησάντων  
 τὸ παιδίον,  
 καὶ προσενεγκάντων αὐτῷ  
 δῶρα, χρυσὸν  
 λίβανον καὶ σμύρναν . . .  
 Καὶ ὁ Ἡρώδης, μὴ ἐπανελθόντων . . .  
 ἀλλὰ κατὰ τὰ κελευσθέντα αὐτοῖς  
 δι' ἄλλης ὁδοῦ  
 εἰς τὴν χώραν αὐτῶν  
 ἀπαλλαγέντων,  
 πάντας ἀπλῶς  
 τοὺς παῖδας  
 τοὺς ἐν Βηθλεὲμ  
 ἐκέλευσεν ἀναιρεθῆναι.  
 Καὶ τοῦτο ἐπεπροφητεύετο  
 μέλλειν γενέσθαι διὰ Ἱερεμίου  
 εἰπόντος·  
 “Φωνὴ ἐν Ῥαμᾷ ἠκούσθη,  
 κλαυθμὸς καὶ ὀδυρμὸς πολὺς·  
 Ῥαχὴλ κλαίουσα τὰ τέκνα αὐτῆς,  
 καὶ οὐκ ἤθελε παρακληθῆναι,  
 ὅτι οὐκ εἰσι.”

The similarity in point of phraseology evinces, in more than one instance, the source from which Justin drew; but the citation from Jeremiah is decisive. How does it happen that the same prophetic passage of the Old Testament occurred to his mind as to Matthew's; that, contrary to his custom, he, like the latter, deserted the Septuagint, and translated the Hebrew just as Matthew did, to a syllable? How happens it that he does this twice in one short narrative?

Besides, does not Irenæus, at a later period, in his third book, 9th chapter, give the entire contents of Matthew's 2d chapter, expressly designating the source from which he drew? Do we not find the same in Tertullian, in his 5th book against Marcion, 9th chapter? Celsus, moreover, knew of two Gospels which contained genealogies, and mentions the arrival of the wise men under the guidance of a star.<sup>1</sup>

Even if Justin's pupil, Tatian, did omit Matthew's genealogy in his

<sup>1</sup> Orig. Contr. Cels. L. II. c. 32. L. I. c. 40. 58. 66.



Monotessaron, can anything be inferred from this? Did he not likewise omit Luke's?

It is worthy of notice, that in the early times, before the third century, considerable anxiety was felt in regard to the discrepancy of the genealogies, and attempts were made to reconcile them. Julius Africanus refuted these hypotheses of his predecessors, to make way for one of his own.<sup>1</sup> This candid and intelligent critic (for such he was, as is shown by his letter to Origen on the story of Susanna), and his predecessors, likewise, were so far from finding in the Mss. then in circulation good ground for rejecting this chapter and thus ending the difficulty at once, that both he and they resorted to explanations of the most forced character.

And would it not even be a matter of surprise, if Matthew, who strove to convince the Jews that Jesus was the Messiah, had neglected to show that he was of the house of David, a circumstance which the Jews regarded as a most essential characteristic of the Messiah?

Further, is not the same mode of procedure, the same peculiar style which distinguishes Matthew throughout his work, evinced in the citations from the Old Testament, which occur in these two chapters?

### § 75.

#### Mark 16: 9—20.

The Gospel of Mark ended formerly in many Mss. with ἐφοβοῦντο γὰρ (16: 8), and contained nothing at all of what we find now in printed books from ἀναστὰς (v. 9) to the end. This we are told by worthy and celebrated men of the fourth century, as e. g. by Gregory of Nyssa, in Cappadocia, in his second Homily on the resurrection, in which he says, that in the *more accurate* Mss., the Gospel of Mark ended with ἐφοβοῦντο γὰρ; and by Jerome, who appeals to *almost all* the Greek Mss., in which, according to his testimony the verses from 16: 9 to the end of the Gospel, were not to be found (*Quæst. ad Hedib. Quæst. 3*).

It is a serious matter, that, according to the declaration of the first-mentioned father, the more accurate copies did not contain this portion of the narrative; and the account of Jerome appears still more authoritative, as he even appeals to nearly all the Mss.

He himself, however, restricts his statement in regard to the number of the Mss. For he says that, *in quibusdam exemplaribus, et maxime Græcis codicibus*, there occurred an important various reading after the 14th verse in this same doubtful passage; whence it is clear that there were not wanting numerous Mss. which contained this disputed portion of the history, and that in the first statement something must be attributed to the rhetorical style of the author (*Dial. II. Adv. Pelag. c. 15*). Next, what is meant by the *more accurate copies* of the Nyssene father? Were they the copies which were most carefully written? This would

<sup>1</sup> Τὰς μὲν τῶν λοιπῶν δόξας ὡς βιαίους καὶ διεψευσμένους ἀποδείξας. Euseb. H. E. L. I. c. 6.

seem to be what he meant by the expression; but in deciding this question, we are not to ask about the care of the transcribers, but by what critics the text was settled, to what Recension the Mss. belonged. Was it to the Recension of Origen, Hesychius, or Lucian? Certainly not to Origen's, or the Palestinian Recension; for Victor of Antioch and the Scholiasts are unanimous in stating, that the *Παλαιστιναῖον εὐαγγέλιον* contained the verses.<sup>1</sup> The Mss. of the Recension of Lucian, too, invariably contain it. We cannot say exactly the same in regard to the Egyptian Recension.

Its most distinguished Mss., viz. C and L, together with the Lower-Egyptian version, recognize the passage. The Vatican Ms., however, the oldest in our possession, deviates from the Recension as to this point, and excludes it. It is true that this deviation is attributable solely to the private opinion of the calligraphist; but so much, at least, is plain, viz. that he must have been acquainted with Mss. which led him to venture this critical innovation.

If we look further back to the period of the *κοινὴ ἔκδοσις*, we find that the Greek text of Codex D contains the passage in question, as far as the words in v. 15, *πάσῃ τῇ κτίσει*. These words, with the remainder of the chapter, have been destroyed by time and supplied by a later hand. The oldest father who refers to this passage is Irenæus (*Adv. Hæc.* L. III. c. 10): "*In fine autem evangelii ait Marcus: et quidem dominus Jesus, postquam locutus est eis, receptus est in cælos et sedet ad dextram Dei.*" The next is Hippolytus, at the beginning of the treatise *Περὶ Χρισμάτων*, which is enumerated among his works on the celebrated marble monument.<sup>2</sup> The Peschito contains it, as well as the Latin version of the first period. True, the splendid but much injured Ms. at Verona wants all after chap. 16, v. 7, and the neater and less injured Ms. at Brescia, which contains a mixed text, has met with a still greater loss, viz. all of the book after 15: 66; but the better preserved Mss. of Vercelli and Corvey, the fathers Augustine and Ambrose,<sup>3</sup> together with Leo the Great, all three of whom made use of the ancient version, are evidences in favor of the passage in question.

The Sahidic version has a considerable chasm here, from a loss of part of the Ms., which Woide supplies from *Cod. Askew*. From this it may certainly be argued that the *Valentinians* read the passage, but not that the Upper-Egyptian version contained it.

Though hardly any Mss. or versions, which have come to us uninjured, want the disputed verses, there is still this difficulty, viz. that, according to the testimony of Jerome and Gregory of Nyssa, according to the Vatican Ms., and *Codd.* 137, 138, both of which mark the passage with asterisks, and according to a *scholium* of which we shall speak presently, many ancient Mss. did not contain them. Something of this kind seems to be evinced by the *Canones* of Eusebius, which are

<sup>1</sup> Matthæi, Nov. Test. T. II. Animadv. ad Marc. 16: 9 seq. p. 266. Birch, N. T. Adnot. ad hunc loc. p. 316.

<sup>2</sup> We shall look in vain in Clem. Romanus for the passage referred to in some editions of the N. T. It is in Pseudo-Clement's Constit. Apost. L. VIII. c. 1. I find, too, no passage in Justin Martyr, nor in Clement of Alexandria. They can occur only in a *catena*.

<sup>3</sup> The principal passage is Ambros. Exposit. in Lucam. L. X. fin.

continued only to ἐφοβοῦντο γάρ.<sup>1</sup> Yet this circumstance is not of so much importance as is thought by some. These *Canones* do not give us any information as to the condition of the Mss., but only as to the Harmony of Ammonius; for they were merely an expedient made use of by Eusebius to designate the sections of the Harmony in the common Mss. of the Gospels. Now the reason that the *Canones* end at this point, is simply that the Harmony of Ammonius did not contain the passage, and therefore no reference could be made to it.

That in ancient times the verses were wanting in many Mss., is certain; the fact is well attested, though it scarcely appears in the revised text. Now how can we explain this fact? Were men pressed by exegetical difficulties; and did they, because this passage could not be reconciled with the other Gospels, attempt to get rid of it in a summary manner?

Jerome makes a confession of this nature. The Latins could not reconcile the discordant expressions of Matthew and Mark, *vespere sabbati* and *mane sabbati*; and tried to find in the Mss. of Mark which wanted the passage in question, an excuse for rejecting what they could not explain.<sup>2</sup> Supposing that the Mss. did not at first present any excuse for doing so, might not the Latins be induced by the difficulty mentioned, to make the passage suspicious in a critical view, by marking it with signs to that effect? This being done, subsequent copyists would not fail to get completely rid of this inconvenient passage.

But were this explanation correct, the passage must have been wanting in the Mss. of the Latins; while, according to Jerome, it was not these, but the Greek Mss., which did not contain it. Other indications, too, point us to Greek Mss. The Greeks, however, knew nothing of this difficulty. Gregory of Nyssa, in the discourse before cited, correctly explains ὥπὲ σαββάτου by the expressions ὥπὲ καιροῦ, ὥπὲ τῆς ὥρας, ὥπὲ τῆς χρονίας.<sup>3</sup> If the προῖ πρώτῃ σαββάτου in Mark 16: 9, occa-

<sup>1</sup> Schol. Cod. apud Birch. Ἐως ὧδε—Ἐνσέβιος ἐκάνονισεν. In the celebrated Alexandr. Codex the numbers extend no further than ἐφοβοῦντο γάρ.

<sup>2</sup> "Hujus quæstionis duplex solutio est: aut enim non accipimus Marci testimonium, quod in raris fertur evangeliiis, omnibus Græciæ libris pene hoc capitulum in fine non habentibus, præsertim cum diversa atque contraria cæteris evangelistis narrare videatur; aut hoc respondendum, quod uterque verum dixerit: Matthæus, quod Dominus surrexit *vespere Sabbati*, Marcus autem, quando eum viderit Maria Magdalena, id est *mane primo sabbati*," etc. (Ad Hedib. Quæst. 3. Opp. Hieron. T. I. p. 825. Ed. Vallars. F. Matthæi, N. T. Tom. IV. p. 268 seq.)

<sup>3</sup> Greg. Nyss. Opp. T. III. p. 402. Ed. Paris. 1638. So, too, Dionysius of Alexandria in Epist. Canon. ad Basilidem, Bevereg. Pandect. Canon. Oxon. 1672, and at the end of Greg. Thaum. Macar. et Basil. Opp. 1622, Paris. Some, he says, understand the word ὥπὲ according to common usage, as being equivalent to ἑσπέρα: learned men, however, say that ὥπὲ denotes delay and length of time, βραδυτῆτα καὶ μακρόν χρόνον. An anonymous writer, Εἰς τὰς μυροφόρους γυναῖκας (inter Spuria Chrysostomi, Tom. VIII. p. 159. Montfauc.), appeals to the common mode of speech in Greek: ὡς εἰώθαμεν λέγειν, ὥπὲ τῆς ὥρας, ὥπὲ τοῦ καιροῦ, frequent and well-known expressions.

I must here be allowed to mention another possible ground of the omission in some Mss. of the passage in question, viz. the difference of opinion in respect to Lent. The letter of Dionysius to Basilides was occasioned by an inquiry on this subject. Some thought that our Lord rose at midnight, and therefore they left off fasting about this time; the Romans believed him to have risen in the



sioned difficulty, when compared with the *ὅψέ* of Matthew, they would have seen that the portion which they felt it necessary to reject must begin several verses earlier. The words *λίαν πρωῖ—ἀνατείλαντος τοῦ ἡλίου* (Mark 16: 2), are properly the parallel clause to Matthew's *ὅψέ σαββάτων*, and are as contradictory to it as the expression in v. 9. There are no other difficulties in the passage in Mark, which may not be urged likewise as to Matthew, and in part as to Luke, compared with John. We cannot, therefore, expect from this quarter any grounds of decision as to its genuineness, and must turn to the internal evidence in the passage itself.

Mark's mode of narration is never so irregular and disorderly, as to lead us to expect such an awkward termination of his work as *ἐξοβούντο γὰρ*, in v. 8, would be. It is plain that this, instead of being a conclusion, is but a preparation for something to follow.

Let us consider the tenor given to his account of the resurrection by this termination: The women came to the sepulchre, found the stone rolled away, were addressed by a young man clothed in a white garment, who told them that Jesus had risen, and commanded them to communicate this information to the disciples, with the injunction that they should go into Galilee, where they should see our Lord. *They, however, said nothing to any man, for they were afraid.* Here the Gospel would end. If Mark terminated it in this way, he closed his account of an occurrence which was the most important evidence in favor of Christianity, with assuring us that nothing was known of the resurrection at the time; that nothing could have been known about it, inasmuch as those on whose testimony the fact rests, told no one of it. He himself might then be asked, how he knew and was able to relate what happened to the women, if they told no one of it. An inconceivable want of consideration in so important a matter! Even if he had no intention of attesting the occurrence by further evidence, he was at any rate bound to inform the reader how the incident in respect to the women was divulged and became notorious. He would thus present clearly at least one argument drawn from the declarations of witnesses, though that be the weakest of all which are exhibited in the Gospels.

Now this very portion of the history which is denied to have been

---

morning, and did not break their fast till cock-crowing: *οἱ μὲν γὰρ ἐν Ῥώμῃ ἀδελφοί, ὥς φασι, περιμένονσι τὸν ἀλέκτορα.* We know with what pertinacity the churches adhered to such traditionary usages. Now those who broke their fast at midnight had this passage of Mark against them; particularly the first words, *ἀναστὰς δὲ πρωῖ πρώτη σαββάτου.* If he arose early on the first day of the week, it was necessary that the fast should be prolonged till morning. Yet a satisfactory solution of the difficulty was found, in referring *πρωῖ πρώτη σαββάτου* to the next words, *ἐφάνη πρωῶτον.* (Greg. Nyssen. in the above-mentioned discourse, p. 411, and Victor Antioch. in Caten. in Marc. Ed. Possini). Before this solution was obtained, however, it may very probably have been the case that these verses of Mark were treated as suspicious in order to vindicate particular usages. We find them excluded from an Egyptian Ms., Cod. B; Cod. L at least casts suspicion on them in a Scholium, of which we shall speak presently; and Ammonius excluded it from his Monotessaron. Now it was customary in some churches of Egypt to break the fast before the cock-crowing, as Basilides says: *περὶ δὲ τῶν ἐνταῦθα ἔλεγε, ὅτι τάχιον, viz. τῶν ἐν Ῥώμῃ ἀδελφῶν.* This coincidence deserves to be remarked, though it is not by any means sufficient to serve as the basis for any positive conclusion.



written by Mark, is an account how the women came to tell of what had happened to them, how little credit was given to their narrative, and from what other subsequent occurrences satisfactory assurance of the fact was obtained.

The preposterous nature of such a termination, both in a grammatical and historical point of view, was perceived even by those Greeks who did not receive the passage; for some of them added a conclusion of their own, which satisfied at least the principal requisitions that could be made of the author. It was as follows: *Πάντα δὲ τὰ παρηγγελμένα τοῖς περὶ τὸν Πέτρον συντόμως ἐξήγγειλαν. Μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα καὶ αὐτὸς ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἀπὸ ἀνατολῆς καὶ ἄχρι ὀνόσεως ἐξαπέστειλε δι' αὐτῶν τὸ ἱερόν καὶ ἄγθαρτον κήρυγμα τῆς αἰωνίου σωτηρίας* (*Schol. Cod. L. et in marg. versionis Philox.*). Let us hear what the great master in matters of New Testament criticism says on this subject. He calls the conclusion *ἐθοβοῦντο γάρ* "clausulam abruptissimam;" and further declares, "omnibus incredibile videri debebat, Marcum sic finivisse commentariolum suum," etc.<sup>1</sup>

We have come, then, to this point. It is admitted, that the termination would be abrupt, the book grammatically and historically incomplete, if Mark had closed his work at 16: 8. Supposing the Gospel, then, to have once actually terminated thus, either the author must have been suddenly taken away by death, or he must have been interrupted in his work by the death of his voucher. In the first case it was impossible that the work should have any further addition from him; in the other case, not only was such an addition possible, but it was his duty not to leave the book in this condition; he was bound to conclude it properly as soon as circumstances permitted.

It is only on the supposition that the author was overtaken by death before he had finished his work, that we can believe the remainder to have been added by another hand. In that case, however, the language of the part added must wear a somewhat different appearance from the rest; as is the fact in regard to the 8th book of Thucydides, which is supposed, from the change in the style, to have been added by his daughter after her father's death.

If it be objected, that the addition to Mark is too small for us to determine anything from the style, I answer, it is well known that a different tone and a peculiar style of expression may manifest themselves in a short compass.<sup>2</sup> As to his death, moreover, history informs us that after the composition of his Gospel he left Rome, went to Egypt, and taught at Alexandria.<sup>3</sup> Thus we have no internal or external grounds for supposing the author's death; which alone could justify the position that the conclusion of the book is by another hand.

<sup>1</sup> Griesbach, Comm. Crit. in text. Græc. N. T. Particula II. p. 199.

<sup>2</sup> We have a proof of this in the very conclusion (*πάντα δὲ τὰ παρηγγελμένα κ. τ. λ.*) which, as we have said, was appended to some Mss. The expression *συντόμως* in it is almost wholly foreign to the N. T. Instead of *ἱερόν*, the usual biblical expression is *ἅγιον*; and *ἄγθαρτον*, connected with *κήρυγμα*, comes from the rhetorical language of the fathers. Such deviation from N. T. diction do we find in the compass of four lines.

<sup>3</sup> Euseb. H. E. L. II. c. 16. Epiph. Hær. LI. § 6. Hieronym. Catal. v. Marcus. Gelas. Decret. de script. apocryph. Mansi Collect. Concil. T. VIII. p. 147. Eutych. Alexandr. Annal. T. I. p. 334. and 337. text. Arab.

On the other supposition, viz. that he was interrupted in his work by the death of his voucher, we can readily see how there may have been in the most ancient times some copies with, and some without, this concluding passage. The friends of the history of Jesus took or procured copies of what was already written; particularly, as but little was wanting to the completion of the work. When, after some time, the conclusion appeared, it was appended in some Mss., and in others was neglected. Thus it happened that there continued to be Mss. without the conclusion, long after it was written.

The death of the two apostles with whom Mark was at Rome, may easily, as every one will see, have had such an effect on the situation of the Christians in the capital, as to occasion interruptions of their meetings and of Mark's occupations, and perhaps, too, Mark's immediate departure from the city. It appears to me, moreover, that instead of the present concise account of the resurrection, we should have had a more detailed narration of this most important event, had the witness whose statements Mark presents in his Gospel, communicated information respecting it.

On the contrary, however, we see the historian, who elsewhere seems to place his chief merit in the circumstantiality of his narrative, timorously contenting himself with general outlines of the final events of the Gospel history, as though he was unwilling to trust himself when deprived of the authority and testimony of the eyewitness. Every thing is as it must have been under the supposed circumstances.

Others despatch this question in a shorter way. They take it for granted that, at any rate, Mark's genuine conclusion is lost, and then, from the admission they manufacture for themselves, pronounce the present conclusion not to be genuine. By the convenient words, *at any rate*, they avoid all argument, and even any explanation how the loss of the genuine conclusion can be regarded as possible. Though it is true that a portion of Luke's history was lost unobserved from the middle of the book, yet we can show that it eluded attention on account of an *ὁμοιοτέλετον*. The same ought to be shown in this case. How could the conclusion of the book disappear and the circumstance be unnoticed? It must have attracted attention. If it happened before copies had been taken, before the publication of the Gospel, Mark might easily have remedied it, and was bound to do so; if it occurred after copies were taken, the genuine conclusion must at least have been preserved in some Mss., and must it not then be the one which we now have?

## § 76.

### JOHN CHAP. 21.

In reading the 30th and 31st verses of the 20th chapter of John's Gospel, we expect that the book is to be there concluded, and are perplexed to find, that after the writer has, as it were, taken the last look at his work, and apologized for its incompleteness by stating its object,

which allowed him only to relate such events as proclaimed Jesus to be the Son of God, the Christ, the author of life to men,—that after thus (apparently) concluding what he had undertaken to accomplish, he abruptly commences his narrative anew. This it was that first excited suspicion respecting the last chapter, which is so completely dis severed from connexion with the rest of the history; and further plausibility was soon conferred on the suspicion by the researches of learned men.<sup>1</sup> No one, however, has attacked it with so much force as a celebrated biblical scholar of our own times.<sup>2</sup> He regards it as an appendix by another hand, and explains the occasion of its composition in the following way.

The saying had spread abroad, that John was to live on this earth till the last coming of our Lord, according to the express promise of Jesus (John 21: 22, 23). John was now dead, and the Saviour had not appeared. From this fact arose injurious inferences in respect to the delay of Christ's coming, and even in respect to the truth of Christianity. To obviate these, some well-meaning man composed this supplement to John's Gospel, and showed from the language of Jesus that an incorrect signification would be assigned to it, if it were interpreted as promising that the coming of our Lord should take place during the lifetime of John.

His first argument is, that the difference of style shows it to have been an appendix by another hand. John, who is accustomed always to speak of himself in the third person, uses here the first person singular, in the Attic dialect moreover, *οἶμαι* (21: 25), and the first person plural (21: 24), *οἶδαμεν ὅτι κ. τ. λ.*

Now, how frequently he expresses himself in the same way in his Epistles, which were written at the same time. Does he not use the words, *γράφω, ἔγραψα, ἀκηκόαμεν, ἐωράκαμεν* (1 Ep. 2: 13, 14. 1: 1, 2, 3, seq.)? Does he not say at the commencement of his Gospel, *ἔθεασάμεθα τὴν δόξαν αὐτοῦ* (1: 14)? And has he never, in any other part of his book, used Attic forms? What then, are *ἀκηκόαμεν* and *ἐωράκαμεν* (John 3: 11. 4: 42. 5: 37. 8: 38. 14: 9)?

It is said, however, that there have crept into this chapter, from tradition, inaccurate statements, which cannot have been made by John. The disciples are represented as living in Galilee between the resurrection and ascension of Jesus; which cannot be correct, as eight days after the resurrection they are still at Jerusalem (John 20: 26).

But, after making their observations and inquiries on the theatre of his death and resurrection, they may, sometime during the following 32 days, have gone to Galilee, whither they were directed to go after the resurrection, not only by the account of the women, but likewise by our Saviour himself (Matth. 26: 32. Mark 14: 28).

It is replied, however, that directly after the resurrection they received command not to leave Jerusalem (Luke 24: 49). How then could they be in Galilee?

<sup>1</sup> Grotius, Adnot. ad Joann. XX. 30. Ger. John Vossius, Harm. Evang. L. III. Cap. 4. § 8. Joann. Clericus, Biblioth. Univers. T. II. p. 473.

<sup>2</sup> Eberh. Gottl. Paulus, in the "Neuen Repert. für bibl. und morgenl. Litt." Th. II.



The case is not as represented. The Acts of the Apostles is more precise on this point. Our Lord lived forty days with his disciples, before he enjoined upon them not to leave Jerusalem till they, *οὐ μετὰ πολλὰς ἡμέρας*, within a few days, should receive the Holy Ghost (Acts 1: 3, 4, 5). The idea that they received the injunction directly after the resurrection, does not find countenance even in Luke's Gospel; but there, as in the Acts, it was our Lord's last direction, after which he was parted from them and was taken up into heaven. There are, therefore, more than thirty days remaining for the occurrences in Galilee.

Is it any thing incredible, that John himself should have refuted an error which arose in regard to him during his lifetime, and the ill consequences of which were apparent? Why should he surrender to another hand a task which he could best perform himself, and which it was especially incumbent on him to perform?

Examine the narrative. From its nature it must have been composed before John's death. It is animated by a particularity which we could expect only from an eye-witness, by whom every circumstance was remarked with extreme interest, and lodged deep in his memory. He not only recalls every individual concerned, though he wrote many years after the occurrence, but many incidental things which one would far less expect to find stated. He still knows exactly how and with what Peter girt himself in haste to go to our Lord. With the practised eye of a fisherman, he judges the distance of the ship from the land: *It was not far, but as it were two hundred cubits, from land*. He still knows the number of the fishes which they caught. Nor does he give merely a general statement of the number; not a single one escapes him: *They were an hundred fifty and three*. He still wonders, too, how it happened that the net did not break.

Now who could know all these minute circumstances after the lapse of years, unless he had been one of those engaged in catching the fishes, and had shared them with the rest? Is not the eye-witness and participator visible every where? Who was there that could have written in this manner after John's death? Was he not one of the most youthful of the disciples of Jesus, and did he not die a *πρεσβύτερος*, an old man?

He himself perceived, however, that such an appendix, subjoined after the apparent conclusion of his work, might be subject to suspicion; and therefore he added expressly: *It is this disciple* (viz. he who lay in Jesus' bosom, and of whom Jesus spoke thus), *who testifies these things and wrote them*. So much precaution has he himself taken.

Now if the style is not his, if the narrative is interlarded with inaccurate traditions, and yet his subscription is put to the book for the sake of the authority of his name, it is a forgery, and we can make no great account of the honesty of the well-meaning man who committed it.

On the other hand, if we compare the words in 21: 8 with 6: 19, in which likewise John designates distance on the water, we find a more than accidental similarity, reminding us of the former occupation of the writer. Another of his customs, which we have mentioned above, with examples (§ 60, towards the end), viz. that of accompanying the words of our Lord with interpretations of his own, is exhibited in this chapter. There is even a remarkable similarity in phraseology to



an instance in the former part of the Gospel: 21: 19, τοῦτο δὲ εἶπε, σημαίνων ποίῳ θανάτῳ δοξάσει τὸν θεόν; 12: 33, τοῦτο δὲ ἔλεγε, σημαίνων ποίῳ θανάτῳ ἤμελλεν ἀποθνήσκειν.

And how much fidelity is exhibited in the narrative! Can it be the production of an impostor? mere gossip, compiled from various reports? How psychological is his representation of the demeanor of the fishermen, particularly. How could he so happily delineate Peter's conduct in exact accordance with his character? Peter no sooner hears that it is our Lord, than he throws himself impetuously into the sea to get to him; exactly as we should expect from the vehemence of his feelings, and his deportment in other cases. The conduct of the other disciples is different; they know it is our Lord, but have not presence of mind enough to speak to him.

Jesus afterwards asks Peter three times: *Lovest thou me?*—a mild reproof for the past, for his having three times denied him. How appropriate! How entirely free from passion and from human feeling!

The apostle appears differently. At the third repetition of the question, he cannot retain his composure; his character is again displayed. He is not angry, however; how could he be at this moment? We should expect that the affection of his mind would be different. He is grieved.

Jesus quiets the impetuous disciple by giving him his whole confidence; showing him, however, at the same time, the prospect of a death of suffering. The apostle understands our Lord, but shrinks not at the prospect; he does not stand embarrassed and lost in thought respecting himself. In regard to thousands this would be unnatural; but not in regard to him. Such must have been the first impression on his mind; such it was on a former occasion (22: 33), and must still more have been so on this.

What, now, is more natural than the particular turn which his mind takes; viz. that he should inquire what was to become of him with whom he vied in our Lord's affections? And what is more suitable than the reply of Jesus: Is it any matter to thee, if I have allotted him a milder fate?

This chapter, then, has far too much truth of representation and internal fidelity, too much consistency with the character and situation of the persons, to be regarded as a compilation of various reports, or as a fiction of pious fraud.

In regard to the last two verses, however: *This is the disciple which testifieth of these things, and wrote these things; and we know that his testimony is true. And there are also many other things which Jesus did,* etc.; if, on the ground that the phraseology is that of a third person, and the last words contain a hyperbole, we suppose them not to have been written by John, but that, as Dr. Less thinks, they were added by the church at Ephesus, in confirmation of the appendix, we have here the authority of contemporaries, the members of a church of great respectability, to prove that he was the author of the chapter.

## § 77.

## ACTS OF THE APOSTLES.

The Acts and Gospel of Luke together form a whole, of which the latter is the first part, and the former the second. In the Gospel he presents the history of Jesus till his ascension; in the Acts he resumes the thread of the narrative, where he had dropped it in his former history. By comparing the beginning of the Acts with the end of the Gospel, we see clearly, that in writing the latter, he reserved a detailed account of the ascension for his following work, and that, while occupied in finishing the Gospel, he already had the intention of continuing the history, as he afterwards did in the Acts.

Thus Luke himself regarded the two works. The Gospel he calls in Acts 1: 1, *πρῶτον λόγον*, *the first treatise*, the first part, the object of which was to acquaint us with the actions and doctrines of Jesus, *ὃν ᾔρξατο ποιεῖν τε καὶ διδάσκειν*. This could be called a first part only in reference to a second. The Acts, consequently, are the *δεύτερος λόγος*, the object of which is to inform us respecting the consequences and results of our Saviour's projects after his death, respecting the acts of his disciples, and the progress and increase of the sect he had founded.

## § 78.

The contents of the book are as follows. After our Lord has given his last injunctions, he ascends into heaven. The apostles supply the place of Judas (—2:). On the day of Pentecost the Spirit is poured out; effects of it; ill-founded opinions of some of the spectators; counter-explanation of Peter in an address to the people; its impression on the hearers. Increasing respect for the apostles; circumstances of the church at Jerusalem (—3:). Peter and John heal a man lame from his birth, in the temple; astonishment and assemblage of the people on account of it. Peter declares Jesus to be the author of the miracle. The captain of the temple hastens thither, sees the tumult, hears the speaker, and takes him with his companion to prison (—4:). On the following day the Sanhedrim assembles; the two apostles are brought before it. Peter defends himself with boldness. He and John are set at liberty, with the injunction to teach no longer concerning Jesus. They come to their companions, and are received with enthusiasm (—4: 32). Community of goods among the Christians; hypocritical fraud of Ananias and his wife (—5: 12). Miraculous cures are performed by the apostles; the Sanhedrim, vexed at these miracles, imprisons the apostles. An angel liberates them; they teach publicly in the temple; are apprehended anew, and carried before the Sanhedrim. They defend themselves; Gamaliel addresses the council; at his instance the apostles are set at liberty, after being scourged; they, however, continue to teach in the temple (—6:). The Hellenists murmur respecting the care taken of their widows; deacons are elected for this business; and among them is Stephen. His zeal for converting the people and his violent death

(—8:). Philip teaches at Samaria; many believe; among them Simon, who offers money for the gifts of the Spirit. On the road to Gaza, Philip meets with the treasurer of Candace; instructs him respecting the Messiah, and baptizes him (—9:). Saul persecutes the disciples of Jesus; is converted while thus employed, and then preaches Jesus at Damascus; is for that reason obliged to flee; goes to Jerusalem and then to Tarsus (—9: 31). Peter visits the believers in Lydda; cures Eneas; visits Joppa; restores Tabitha to life; baptizes Cornelius at Cæsarea; justifies himself before the church at Jerusalem for baptizing this Gentile (—11: 19).

Meanwhile the church at Antioch takes its rise. Barnabas is sent thither from Jerusalem; seeks Saul; and they perform together the duties of the ministry (—11: 26). At Antioch Agabus prophesies a famine; Saul and Barnabas are on this account sent to the Holy City. At this time Agrippa puts to death James the elder; and casts Peter into prison, who is miraculously liberated and departs to another place; Agrippa dies (—12: 24). Saul and Barnabas are sent from Antioch to preach in foreign countries. They go to Cyprus; from thence to the continent into Asia Minor. An account is given of what they did in Antioch of Pisidia, at Iconium, at Lystra, of their return and report of their proceedings (—15: 1). Dissension in the church at Antioch respecting the obligatory force of Jewish institutions upon the Gentiles. Paul and Barnabas are sent a second time to the Holy City. Solemn consultation at Jerusalem, and decision of the question in dispute. A deputation from Jerusalem accompanies Paul and Barnabas back to Antioch (—15: 36). Paul and Barnabas concert a new journey to Asia Minor; they separate; Paul goes with Silas. At Lystra, Paul and Silas take Timothy to be their companion; travel through Phrygia and Galatia; embark for Europe (—16: 10).

Luke accompanies them from Troas to Philippi; what befalls them there. They travel through Macedonia to Athens and Corinth (—18: 2). Paul teaches at Corinth; is driven thence; goes by way of Ephesus to Jerusalem; thence returns to Ephesus, where he teaches till he is driven from this city also (—20: 1). He again turns his course to Macedonia and Achaia; repairs once more to Jerusalem with Luke; is imprisoned. Paul's defence before the people; before the Sanhedrim; before Felix, Festus, and Agrippa the younger; his departure for Rome; occurrences on the voyage, and arrival at Rome.

The whole book divides itself into *three sections*; viz. first, the establishment of Christianity in Palestine; secondly, the origin of the church at Antioch, and expeditions thence into the heathen countries of Asia; and lastly, expeditions to Europe, in which Luke appears as Paul's companion. This last section might be divided further into two parts; viz. occurrences in relation to Paul which took place after the historian had become closely connected with him (16: 10), and such occurrences after the period when Luke became his inseparable companion (20: 6—28: 31).

### § 79.

In a portion of his work the author does not merely represent himself as an eye-witness of the events he relates, but introduces himself

into the narrative as a participator in them; though this is not the case till a late stage of the history (Acts 16: 10 seq. and 29: 6 seq.). He may, however, have witnessed a great part of the events which he narrates in the *first section* of his book, unless Palestine, where he resided during the life of Jesus, was left by him directly after our Lord's death. As it would be precipitate and arbitrary to extend the declaration which he makes in the introduction of his Gospel, to everything which he relates as having taken place in Palestine, without recollecting that it properly refers only to the contents of the Gospel; so it would be no less arbitrary to assume that he did not remain in that country an hour longer than the compass of his Gospel requires. The Proœmium asserts Luke's residence in Palestine during the period referred to; but does not prevent us from supposing a continuance of his stay.

This being premised, we must learn from the tenor of the book of Acts, how long we can and ought to regard him as having resided in Palestine. If we consider the uncommon knowledge of facts evinced by the writer in the section relating to what occurred in Palestine, we shall readily believe that he had not as yet left the country. This perfect acquaintance with facts continues without diminution to the second section, i. e. the founding of the church at Antioch (11: 19). From this moment he turns away from Palestine, and does not speak at all of the elders of Jerusalem or of occurrences there, except when deputies from Antioch appear in that city, and then only during their stay (Acts 12: 1—25, and 15: 4—30).

The abrupt transition from occurrences in Palestine may have arisen either from a sudden inaction on the part of the elders and ministers there, and consequently a deficiency of events worthy of record, or from a change in the point of view occupied by the historian. The more incredible the former supposition is, the greater ground is there for adopting the latter; viz. that Luke left Palestine when Christianity began to take root in Antioch. After a time, however, he deserts the church at Antioch likewise. The reason of this change is apparent in the course of the narrative itself. Luke removed to Troas (Acts 16: 8—10), where he was ignorant of the occurrences in the church at Antioch. On the other hand, it was owing to this change of residence that he was an eye-witness of Paul's reception in Europe and his first proceedings in this quarter of the world, and was even his companion in the passage over. This opened the way to further intimacy with him, and thus enabled him to become the historian of the apostle during the last period, in which the scene of his former enterprises became more and more remote.

We see how great an influence Luke's different points of view had upon his history; and we hope to elucidate it further by considering the three sections more particularly. In the third section, Luke is explicit and diffuse so long as he is at Paul's side, or even in his vicinity (Acts 16: 10—18:). The more remote he is from the apostle, the more concise is his narrative. The events of a year and a half at Corinth he comprises in seventeen verses (18: 1—17). Nearly all we learn is the arrival and departure of Paul, without a word concerning the importance of the result of his labors, or concerning the condition of the church. Immediately after, he comprises a journey from Ephesus to Jerusalem,



from thence to Antioch, then through Galatia and Phrygia back again to Ephesus, in two verses (18: 22, 23). As soon, however, as the apostle rejoins Luke (20: 6), the narrative recovers its character, and is rendered rich and animated by an agreeable particularity.

In the second section, which is devoted to occurrences connected with the church at Antioch, he speaks only of the origin of the church, the earliest events there, and the peregrinations of Paul and Barnabas from Antioch to Cyprus and Asia Minor (15: 1). He then has nothing to say till the second mission to Jerusalem. When this was accomplished, the apostle abandoned Antioch as his station; and Luke, in the course of a few years from this time, became very intimately connected with Paul. Now in respect to the journey to Cyprus, the proceedings of Paul and Barnabas at the court of the proconsul, their departure, their preaching in Antioch of Pisidia, their fortunes at Iconium, Lystris, etc. (Acts 13: 1—14: 27), the more remarkable circumstances are clearly and somewhat fully depicted; while such things as were not of an unusual character are but slightly noticed. Generally speaking, the narrative is very much such an one as Paul and Barnabas may have given to the church at Antioch on their return.

We next come, however, to a period during which nothing is related in regard either to Palestine or Antioch. This is called by Luke in a general way, *χρόνος οὐκ ὀλίγος*, no inconsiderable time (Acts 14: 28); and it actually comprised several years. On careful consideration it will be found that the transactions of the first expedition into heathen countries may perhaps have taken up two years; but still five whole years, to the twelfth year of the reign of Claudius, are passed over as though no Antioch and no Paul existed. It is not till the twelfth year of this emperor, as we shall see from chronological designations hereafter, that the history commences again with the remarkable dispute concerning the obligatory force of the Jewish observances (15: 1 seq.). Now Luke was in Paul's company the next year, and may have obtained from him a minute knowledge of these recent occurrences (16: 10). The five preceding years, nevertheless, remain vacant. He derived no information from Paul in regard to them; nor was he himself living in Syria or Palestine during the period. These countries certainly continued, however, to be the special field of Christian history. Who can believe that for so long a time nothing memorable took place in Palestine and Syria, or was undertaken by Paul, who had a natural repugnance to inactivity? Whether Luke had gone to Troas, where Paul met him subsequently, or was in some other place, certainly he was not in Antioch or Palestine. Nothing of the kind occurs elsewhere throughout the book; in the third section the order of time is pursued constantly, even though the periods are not always very copiously treated of.

The first section, compared with the two last, exhibits a fulness of which neither of the others can boast. If ever the historian shows himself circumstantially and minutely acquainted with facts and discourses, it is in relation to the occurrences in Palestine. Indeed, only those parts of the third section that narrate incidents of which he was an eye-witness, exhibit such particularity as is uniformly displayed throughout this section. If, therefore, in any part of his book we have reason to regard him as an eye-witness, it is here. A comparison with the most

animated of those narratives which we know to have been composed from personal knowledge, justifies this conclusion as to the whole of the first section.

### § 80.

From these observations the plan of the author is easily understood. It was not his object to relate the part borne by each of the apostles in the diffusion of Christianity, what churches were founded by each of them, and what was their respective fate. Considered in this light, the first section of the work would be extremely imperfect. Nor was it his design in the third section to present the complete history of Paul to a certain period; for he was not in possession of all the facts requisite for this purpose, as we can see from the book of Acts itself, and may be still more fully convinced from the 11th chapter of the 2d Epistle to the Corinthians. He did not propose to himself either of these undertakings beforehand, and then begin to collect materials for its accomplishment. It would have been too late, had he delayed to commence collecting materials for his history until the composition of his Gospel, at which time he first formed his intention to add a second part. The Acts of the Apostles were not the result of any plan previously formed, which he intended to execute by means of subsequent investigations, but of the numerous recollections and *memoranda* which he had stored up. Without any reference to completeness or unity, he presents sometimes remarkable incidents and sometimes large portions of history, just as he happened to observe the facts at the various stations to which he was led by the circumstances of his life. Through the fortunate variety of situation, however, in which he was placed at different times, he actually enables his readers to form a general idea of the mode in which Christianity was preserved and established after the decease of its founder and in a short time diffused into many countries.

### § 81.

The time at which he composed his work and the person for whom it was written had a great influence on its character. The Gospel of Luke, the third in order of time, did not appear till after Paul's death, and of course, then, the Acts of the Apostles did not; for the Gospel of Mark, although it preceded Luke's, was not published till after the decease of Peter and Paul (§ 16). Now if at that time there were found to be chasms in the history of Paul, it was no longer possible to derive explanations from Paul himself; and if the scene of these events was in distant countries, it would have been a very onerous task to procure from thence the necessary information in regard to them. Luke was, therefore, obliged to renounce the idea of completeness, however desirous he may have been of attaining it.

There is yet another circumstance to be considered, which exerted a determining influence upon the extent of the work. He dedicated this book, as well as his Gospel, to his friend Theophilus, and intended it more particularly for his information (Acts 1: 1). In order that it may be intelligible to him, explanations, mostly of a geographical nature, are subjoined by him very frequently, until he comes to the period

of Paul's arrival in Italy. At this point, he ceases to insert such remarks, and seems to be certain that Theophilus is acquainted with the situation of the places he afterwards mentions. Precisely similar is his manner in regard to the facts themselves. The early proceedings of the apostle, and his proceedings in later times at Jerusalem and subsequently till he arrives at Rome, are treated by Luke with much particularity; but Paul is hardly at Rome when he concludes his narrative by merely remarking that Paul spent two whole years here.

Yet, as we see by the apostle's letters from Rome, Luke was constantly with him, might have been a spectator of every thing, and must often have been a fellow-sufferer with him. And these very occurrences in the capital of the world were of special importance in regard to the history of Christianity, and were probably the most interesting in the apostle's life. The charges of his accusers, his trials, his defence, which, as the apostle himself said (Philipp. 1: 12), made his bonds in the *prætorium* honorable and glorious to Christianity, the new accessions to the Christian cause which were gained by him, the exertions of his friends and enemies, the one for his destruction and the other for his preservation, were of high moment to his contemporaries and to the future disciples of Jesus. In respect to all this he says not a word; he does not even mention the judicial sentence which decided the action brought against the apostle, or any reason why he was liberated.

Luke, then, did not write with a view to his contemporaries in the distant countries of Asia, who found great difficulty in procuring circumstantial and authentic accounts of these incidents. As little did he write with a view to posterity. Friendship for the man whose pious curiosity he wished to gratify excluded both considerations from his view. It was written for his benefit; and it was only incidentally that others reaped advantage from it. The ground of observation which Luke supposed Theophilus to occupy was, therefore, the standard of his work; and it was only necessary that he should conduct the individual for whom he wrote to the point where that individual's own knowledge began.

Hence, as on the one hand we owe to his friendship for Theophilus his determination, by means of a Gospel of his own, to free the history of Jesus from the interpolations made in it by unauthenticated writers, to separate what was true and exhibit it in a faithful history; so, on the other hand, it can be attributed only to the relation in which his friend stood in respect to the facts in the Acts of the Apostles, that no historical account of the occurrences at Rome was furnished by Luke for the benefit of his contemporaries and of coming generations.

## § 82.

### *Chronology of the Acts of the Apostles.*

On the chronology of this book much depends in regard to its exposition, and much more in regard to the illustration of the Pauline

Epistles. I have here to correct some inadvertencies which I formerly committed.<sup>1</sup>

There is hardly any passage in the book more definite in a chronological point of view than 11: 28—12: 25. Agabus had prophesied at Antioch an approaching famine; on which account the believers made a collection for the relief of the necessitous in Judea, and sent it by the hands of Barnabas and Paul to Jerusalem. After Luke has narrated the mission of the two teachers (11: 30), he makes a transition to remarkable occurrences at the time in the Holy City (12: 1). These are, the apprehension of Peter, occasioned by the gratification of the people at the execution of James; his miraculous deliverance and departure from Jerusalem; and the death of Herod Agrippa. After this, we are told by Luke, the deputies returned to Antioch (12: 25). The chronological coincidence of these events with the residence of the two deputies at Jerusalem, we infer from the representation of the historian; not merely from the words *κατ' ἐκεῖνον τὸν καιρὸν* (12: 1), but also from the order of the narrative, which includes these events within the period during which Barnabas and Paul resided at Jerusalem, no account being given of the return of the deputies to Antioch until after these occurrences are narrated.

Consequently, this period must likewise have included the death of Agrippa, which occurred, as represented, about this time. Directly after the fast at which Peter's execution was to have taken place, the king left his usual residence at Jerusalem,<sup>2</sup> and went to Cæsarea, which, according to both Luke and Josephus, was the place of his death (Acts 12: 9. Jos. Ant. L. XIX. c. 8. n. 2). His departure for that place occurred immediately after Peter's deliverance. Now as the deputies were in no haste, the death of the king may easily have occurred during their stay in the Holy City. They had no message which it was necessary to carry back with despatch, and were no longer needed at Antioch, as appears soon after their return (13: 1, 2), and therefore they were not required to hasten their journey home.

Yet, granting that the death of Agrippa did not take place till some months after his arrival at Cæsarea, and that it is related directly, more for the sake of completing the account, than because the event occurred while the two teachers abode at Jerusalem; still the occurrences we have mentioned must have taken place sometime during the year of Agrippa's death.

Now we find this year stated definitely in Josephus: Agrippa died

<sup>1</sup> In composing this sketch I have had the following recent writings before me: "Vogel, "Versuch über chronologische Standpuncte in der Lebensgeschichte Pauli" in Gabler's "Journal für auserlesene theol. Litt." I Bd. I St. "Neuer Versuch über chronol. Standpuncte für die Apostelgeschichte, etc." by Dr. Siskind, in Bengel's "Archiv für die Theologie und ihre neueste Litt." I. Bd. n. XII. and II Bd. 2d St.—Kuinoel, "Comm. in libros Novi Test. Historicos." Vol. 4. Proleg. in Act. Apost.—Bertholdt, "Hist. krit. Einleit. in die Schriften des alten und neuen Test." Th. V. 2d Hälfte. § 629 seq. The limits I have assigned to my work do not permit me to discuss every objection separately, when I differ from these learned men, though I have paid particular regard to them in the development of my arguments.

<sup>2</sup> Jos. Ant. L. XIX. c. 7. n. 3. *Ἦδεῖα γοῦν αὐτῷ διαίτα καὶ συνεχρῖς ἐν τοῖς ἱεροσολύμοις ἦν.*



after having governed four years under Caius and three under Claudius Cæsar. He remarks further for the sake of being more precise: the third year under Claudius had already closed, *τρίτον ἔτος ἤδη πεπληρωτό*.<sup>1</sup>

The deputies from Antioch arrived at Jerusalem at the feast of the passover; for the apprehension of Peter took place at the time of unleavened bread (12: 3), and his execution was to take place after the feast (12: 4). Hence Agrippa's death did not occur until after the passover. Now Claudius ascended the throne in January, and according to Josephus the third year of his reign had closed when Agrippa died. This passover, therefore, cannot have been the passover of the third year of Claudius, but must have been the one in the early part of his fourth year. In this way the time is very definitely fixed. In the third month of the fourth year of the reign of Claudius, Barnabas and Paul arrived at Jerusalem with the gifts of the church at Antioch; and sometime after Agrippa died.

After Agrippa's decease, the famine foretold by Agabus came to pass, viz. under Cuspius Fadus, who, on account of the nonage of Agrippa the younger, was appointed by the emperor to govern the dominions of the father, and likewise under Tiberius Alexander, who succeeded him in this office.<sup>2</sup>

After this incidental remark, we must return once more to the mission of Paul and Barnabas. It has been thought that this is referred to in Galat. 2: 1—15, and chronological inferences have been drawn from this passage, because the apostle in speaking of his visit to Jerusalem, commences with these words: *Then fourteen years after I went up again to Jerusalem*, etc. This is an important designation of time, and hence it is of consequence that we should know to what fact it relates.

I was formerly of opinion (and in this respect I had predecessors of great note), that Paul here refers to the mission on account of the impending famine. But this cannot be the one intended; he must refer to the later one, which he undertook with Barnabas on another occasion (15: 1—4). My reasons are the following. Paul had not on the first occasion been held in high estimation among Christians for a period of fourteen years (Acts 11: 25 seq. comp. Galat. 1: 21—24). At the time when he was sent by the church at Antioch to carry their charitable donations, he was merely a local teacher and assistant of Barnabas at Antioch (Acts 11: 22, 26). His call to the office of an apostle was not acknowledged till after his return from this mission (13: 2).

In the account, however, which he gives of his visit in the Epistle to the Galatians, he appears as an acknowledged apostle, whose labors had justified his pretensions. He had already been a preacher among the Gentiles (Galat. 2: 2), and the evidence was convincing that the instruction of the heathen, *τῆς ἀκροβυστίας εὐαγγέλιον*, and *ἀποστολή*, was committed to his hands; so that as apostle to the Gentiles, he rank-

<sup>1</sup> In the Jewish war, L. II. c. 11. n. 6. he gives only the round number three; for Caius Cæsar had not completed his fourth year. But in Antiq. L. XIX. c. 8. n. 2. he gives the time with all the precision stated: *Τέτταρας μὲν οὖν ἐπὶ Γαίου Καίσαρος ἐβασίλευσεν ἑνιαυτούς—τρεῖς δὲ ἐπιλαβὼν ἐπὶ Κλαυδίου Καίσαρος αὐτοκράτορος*, etc.

<sup>2</sup> Jos. Ant. L. XX. c. 5. n. 2. Comp. B. I. L. II. c. 11. n. 6. Ant. L. III. c. 15. n. 3.

ed himself with Peter, the apostle to the Jews (Gal. 2: 7, 8). His appointment to this office by divine authority (*χαρις θεοῦ*), was so evident, that James, Peter and John, made a division with him, by which they retained the Jews under their own superintendence, and assigned him the whole world beside (Gal. 2: 9).

These circumstances cannot have occurred until Paul had returned from his long journey among the Gentiles (Acts 13: 2. 15:), and was sent a second time with Barnabas from Antioch to Jerusalem, to obtain a decision of the dispute concerning the obligation of the Jewish observances (15: 1—30). This mission must be the one referred to; it took place, he says, fourteen years later than the period when, three years after his conversion, he presented himself before the apostles and church at Jerusalem as a fellow-christian and believer (1: 18—2: 1 seq.). The intervening journey to Jerusalem with the charitable donations from Antioch, therefore, is passed over in silence by Paul in his Epistle to the Galatians, as he was not writing his biography, but was endeavoring to show that he did not receive his Gospel from the other apostles, that he was nowise inferior to them in authority, and, from their own confession, was of equal rank and dignity with them. Now if this intervening journey was not to his purpose, it was superfluous to mention it; especially as when it took place he had but just gained some little estimation, and had hitherto exercised only the local office of teacher at Antioch.

The fourteen years which are mentioned ended with the mission in regard to the Jewish observances, and began with Paul's first appearance at Jerusalem as a Christian. Now in what year did this last occurrence take place? Let us examine the circumstances under which it occurred, to see how far they may aid us in determining the year. He came to Jerusalem from Damascus (Gal. 1: 17, 18). From this latter place he was obliged to flee, because he had exasperated the Jews by his preaching. He escaped with difficulty over the walls in a basket; for the Jews sought his life and were watching the gates (Acts 9: 22—29). Paul speaks of this incident in the 2d Epistle to the Corinthians also (11: 32, 33), where we are informed that the governor appointed by Aretas over Damascus (*ὁ ἐν Δαμασκῷ ἐθράρχης*) himself guarded the city, or caused it to be guarded, instigated the Jews to this violence, and supported them in endeavoring to carry it into effect. Now when did Aretas obtain the government of Damascus?

Not long before Pompey entered these regions, on his return from the Mithridatic war, the inhabitants of Damascus, desirous of ridding themselves of an odious prince, had called Aretas, the king of Arabia Petræa, to the government of Cœle-Syria.<sup>1</sup> Pompey had hardly arrived in the vicinity, when, according to the custom of the Romans, he intermeddled with this business, caused Damascus to be taken by his generals,<sup>2</sup> and the Roman arms to be carried into the interior of the territories of Aretas. But the Romans encountered many difficulties in these defiles and deserts, and Aretas on his part was desirous of getting rid of them. Peace was therefore made.<sup>3</sup> Damascus continued under

<sup>1</sup> Jos. Ant. L. XIII. c. 15. n. 2.

<sup>2</sup> Ant. L. XIV. c. 2. n. 3.

<sup>3</sup> Ant. L. XIV. c. 5.

the protection of the Romans. We find its coins from this time stamped with the head of Augustus or Tiberius.<sup>1</sup> Not long before the death of Tiberius, Damascus was involved in a controversy with Sidon, about the respective limits of the cities; both contested their claims before the Roman president of Syria.<sup>2</sup> Thus the city continued free ever after, under the Roman protection.

About this time we meet with another king of Arabia Petræa named Aretas, who at first was on bad terms with the Romans, so that Augustus refused for some time to acknowledge him as king.<sup>3</sup> Herod Antipas carried on a disastrous war against him, and then sought aid of the Romans.<sup>4</sup> Vitellius was commissioned to make war upon Aretas. While Vitellius was advancing against him, he received intelligence of the death of Tiberius. He immediately returned, under the plea that his commission had ceased.<sup>5</sup> The victory over Herod, the return of Vitellius, the change of emperors, and the preparations already made for war, seem to have incited the Arabian to recover Damascus, which had been taken from his ancestors. Prudence required that, if possible, he should recover from the Romans a city which they made use of as a military station, and which would serve him as a protection to his dominions.

A Jewish feast was at hand, when Vitellius was marching against Aretas with his legions.<sup>6</sup> This was probably the passover; for Tiberius died on the 16th of March, and in less than three weeks Vitellius received intelligence of it, and dismissed his army to their winter quarters. Now was the time for the Arabians to invest Damascus and commence the siege. If it be objected that Vitellius would not have permitted this, I reply, that he could not do otherwise. If his commission was at an end, as he said, in regard to a war already proclaimed, it certainly did not extend to a new one.

The Nabathæan king and his governor, however, did not long hold dominion in Damascus. So early as the second year of his reign, Caius Cæsar undertook to regulate the affairs of Asia. He gave a king to the Ituræan Arabs, whose territory was contiguous to that of the Nabathæans, and on one side, moreover, to the district of Damascus, and who frequently disturbed the latter by their inroads. He likewise severed some other parts from Arabia.<sup>7</sup> In these arrangements, an important Roman garrison, like Damascus, could not be forgotten. The Arabians held it, therefore, at most, only from the middle of the 1st till about the close of the 2d year of Caius Cæsar's reign. If we assign Paul's danger and flight to the middle of this period, it will fall in the early part of the second year of Caius' reign. Beginning here, the fourteen years run

<sup>1</sup> Eckhel, Doctr. Numm. Vet. P. I. Vol. III. p. 330, 331. The inscriptions are all Greek.

<sup>2</sup> Jos. Ant. L. XVIII. c. 6. n. 3.

<sup>3</sup> Ant. L. XVI. c. 9. n. 4.

<sup>4</sup> Ant. L. XVIII. c. 5. n. 1 and 3.

<sup>5</sup> Ant. L. XVIII. c. 5. n. 4.

<sup>6</sup> Ant. L. XVIII. c. 5. n. 3.

<sup>7</sup> Dio Cass. L. LIX. p. 649. Ἐν δὲ τούτῳ, Σοαίμῳ μὲν τὴν τῶν Ἰτουραίων τῶν Ἀράβων, Κόντι δὲ τὴν τε Ἀρμενίαν τὴν οὐκιστοῦσαν, καὶ μετὰ τοῦτο καὶ τῆς Ἀραβίας τινὰ . . . ἐχαρίσατο.

on till Paul's second mission to Jerusalem respecting the obligation of the Jewish observances, and terminate in the *twelfth year of the reign of Claudius*.

Further; Paul (Gal. 1: 15—18) reckons *three years* from his conversion to his flight from Damascus to Jerusalem.<sup>1</sup> These three years coincide with the first of Caius and last two of Tiberius. Tiberius reigned twenty-two years and a half, wanting one month. Hence the two years which belong to the reign of Tiberius began about *the middle of his twenty-first year*, and Paul's conversion occurred about this period.

From the termination of the administration of Felix, we derive assistance in fixing the chronology of the Acts. Under Felix Paul was arrested at Jerusalem and carried prisoner to Cæsarea (Acts 21: 27—23: 24). There he remained till Felix was recalled by the emperor, and Porcius Festus succeeded him. The latter, immediately on his accession, sent the apostle to Rome, because he had demanded to receive his sentence from the tribunal of the emperor (25: 26:).

Now when was Felix deposed? Josephus gives us some light on this point. He says at the beginning of his biography, that he was born in the first year of Caius Cæsar. In his 26th year, he says further on, he was obliged to proceed to Rome on the following account. While Felix held the government, some priests who were acquaintances of Josephus, were sent by Felix to Rome to answer charges of a trifling nature, and he was desirous of procuring their liberation; etc.<sup>2</sup>

Caius and Claudius together reigned seventeen years and eight months; Josephus must therefore have lived eight years and four months under Nero, before he went to Rome in the twenty-sixth year of his age. Was Felix at that time still in Judea?

So we might perhaps imagine; but he certainly was not in his station when Josephus made complaint in regard to his tyranny. Such a step would have been extremely hazardous while he retained his authority. We find that it was not till after his deposition from his station that his accusers made their appearance against him and sought justice at Rome.<sup>3</sup> We must therefore place the recall of Felix earlier than the voyage of Josephus.

<sup>1</sup> Some are inclined to reckon these fourteen years, not from the flight from Damascus to Jerusalem, but from his conversion, thus including the three years. The reason they assign is, that Paul would be likely to refer every thing back to this event, the most important of his life. But in the Epistle to the Galatians, the principal thing which he has in view is not his conversion, but the declaration that he had not received instruction in doctrine from the apostles at Jerusalem, but from a higher source. This he shows as to the period during which he must have received his instruction, by stating the places to which he went and those to which he did not go: οἱ δὲ ἀνῆλθον εἰς Ἱερουσόλυμα (Gal. 1: 17); ἔπειτα—ἀνῆλθον εἰς Ἱερουσόλυμα, but only for 15 days (v. 18), and ἔπειτα ἦλθον, but not to Jerusalem (v. 21). As the principal topic is his going or not going, and not his conversion, the subsequent visit (Gal. 2: 1) must refer to an earlier one. So much is clear from the nature of the case, without taking into account the word πάλιν. But πάλιν (πάλιν ἀνέβην) where it is not used antithetically, denotes enumeration, and also repetition, or the recurrence of something similar to what has preceded. It is equivalent to ἐκ δευτέρου, τὸ τρίτον, τέταρτον.

<sup>2</sup> Vita Josephi § 3, and Basil. Ed. p. 626.

<sup>3</sup> Jos. Ant. L. XX. c. 8. n. 9. Josephus set out on his voyage to Rome much later than they; for while he was performing his business there, Poppæa was the acknowledged wife of the emperor (Vita, c. 3), which was not the case before the eighth year of Nero.



The subsequent fortunes of Felix assign his recall to the seventh year of Nero. The complaints brought against him by the Jews were of so weighty a character and so fully established, that he had forfeited his life. Nero pardoned him only at the intercession of Pallas. Pallas was the brother of Felix; and lost his life himself in the eighth consulate under this emperor.<sup>1</sup> We must therefore assign the recall of Felix to the year previous to this event.

I do not comprehend certain objections which have been made against this statement. In the year of Pallas' death, P. Marius and L. Asinius were consuls (*Tacit. Ann.* XIV. 48), and, as Seneca says in his address to Nero after the death of Burrhus (c. 53), this was the *eighth* year of his reign. Burrhus was probably still alive when the accusers of Felix appeared against him (*Jos. Ant.* XX. c. 8. n. 9); and yet he was one of the first victims who perished this year to the great misfortune of Rome. But I do not wish to lay any stress on this. The year of Pallas' death is definitely determined, and Felix must have been recalled before this event, i. e. in the seventh year of Nero.

### § 83.

Having thus specified the occurrences which carry with them definite designations of time, we must now endeavor to fill up a considerable period, which is of great importance as to the chronological relations of several of the Pauline Epistles. This period comprehends the years between the second mission of Paul respecting the obligations of the Jewish usages and his imprisonment at Jerusalem. Some of the events or transactions carry with them the means of determining their dates; others do not.

When Paul and Barnabas had returned from their mission to the Holy City, they continued to teach and to preach in Antioch (*Acts* 15: 35). During this time Peter came to Antioch, where occurred the well-known scene between him and Paul (*Gal.* 2: 11 seq.). After some time, Paul and Barnabas projected a second voyage to Asia Minor (*Acts* 15: 36 seq.); but separated on account of Mark. Paul went afterwards with Silas. The period from the return to Antioch to the commencement of the journey to Asia Minor appears to have comprised several months. It is probable that Paul would not have undertaken it till the severest portion of the winter had past. Barnabas, who purposed merely to visit Cyprus, probably went thither in autumn, to reach the place before winter had set in. It is wholly immaterial, however, even if Paul began his journey in autumn.

Paul set out, probably at the close of winter, for Cilicia, came to Pisidia, Phrygia, and Galatia, and obeyed the call of a vision to go to Europe; embarked, proceeded through Macedonia; visited Athens, and arrived at Corinth, where he took up his abode. It was probably late in the year when the apostle reached this place (*Acts* 15: 40—18: 1).

Here he remained a year and six months (*Acts* 18: 11). From autumn to spring are six months; from spring to spring again one year. As soon as the sea was open, he embarked for Asia (*Acts* 18: 18), and landed at Ephesus. He did not stay here long, however,

<sup>1</sup> *Tacit. Annal.* L. XIV. sec. 65. *Dio Cass. L.* LXII. p. 706, 707. *Joseph. loc. cit.*

on account of the feast which he had determined to keep at Jerusalem (Acts 18: 20, 21). The name of the feast is not mentioned. It was probably that of Pentecost; for if he left Corinth in the spring, he could hardly have reached Jerusalem, by the circuitous route he took, as early as the passover.

From Palestine he went to visit Antioch, where he resided *χρόνον τινα*, an indefinite time, then travelled through Galatia and Phrygia (Acts 18: 23), and came, in accordance with his promise, to Ephesus. Paul, as we shall show in treating of the Epistle to Titus, spent the winter at Nicopolis on the Issus, which may be termed the gates of Asia Minor. From thence he might have reached Ephesus, through Galatia and Phrygia, in a few months.

At Ephesus he taught three months in the synagogue. He left it, however, and taught in the school of Tyrannus for two years (Acts 19: 8, 9, 10). He had intended to remain at Ephesus till Pentecost (1 Cor. 16: 8), but was expelled some time before by an uproar (Acts 19: 21—20: 2). He next departed to Macedonia through which country he travelled, exhorting and admonishing, till he reached Greece, where he abode three months. He then set out on his return, and, at the end of the passover, embarked for Asia (20: 3, 6), and was desirous, if possible, to reach Jerusalem so as to be there at Pentecost (20: 16). From his departure from Ephesus not long before Pentecost, to his arrival at Jerusalem at Pentecost, was, therefore, rather more than a year.

This last voyage demands particular attention, on account of the objections which have been raised against the narrative.<sup>1</sup> Let us then, accompany the apostle, in order to see what foundation there is for the difficulties which have been alleged. Seven days after the passover he left Philippi, arrived in five days at Troas, and remained there seven days (Acts 20: 6). From Troas he went by way of Assos, Mitylene, Chios, and Samos, to Miletus, in four days (20: 13, 14, 15); for Assos is but a small distance from Troas, and not a day's voyage, as has been represented. The ship merely doubled the promontory of Lectos, and then took in the apostle, to proceed to Mitylene. The number of days thus far is twenty-three. But it was the third day of unleavened bread from which the fifty days before Pentecost were reckoned; consequently three days are to be deducted from our twenty-three; so that twenty were past, and thirty remained before Pentecost.

The distance from Samos to Miletus is very short compared with the other day's voyages; consequently the vessel must have arrived at Miletus in the middle of the day. We will not, however, lay any stress on this. Paul sent to Ephesus and called to him the elders of the church, gave them his exhortation on their arrival, took leave and set sail without delay (Acts 20: 16—38). The time thus spent here is unknown; but all could have been accomplished, beyond a doubt, in three days. From Miletus, Paul passed by way of Coos and Rhodes to Patara, in three days (21: 1). At Patara he went on board another vessel. How much delay this caused we do not know; nor how long it was before they reached Tyre. The voyage must have taken, however, as

<sup>1</sup> Bertholdt, Hist. krit. Einl. in das A. und N. T. 6th Th. Note 2 to § 726. p. 3375 seq.

much as double the time occupied in going from Miletus to Patara. Luke does not begin to reckon again until he reaches the continent. At Tyre they stayed seven days (21: 4); thence they went to Ptolemais, a day's journey, and abode there one day (21: 7). On the following day they went to Cæsarea, where they made a longer stay, *ἡμέρας πλείους*, of which no definite designation is given. The time which we know to have been taken from Tyre to Cæsarea, with the one day from Ptolemais to Cæsarea, amounts to ten days. Their stay at Miletus, at Patara, the time taken in passing to Tyre, and, lastly, the *ἡμέρας πλείους* at Cæsarea, are not definitely known. For these, we have twenty days remaining. We must deduct, however, one day for the journey from Cæsarea to Jerusalem, and another for the reason that the apostle was in James' company on the day preceding the feast. There are consequently eighteen days remaining for the unknown intervals of time.

Now if the business at Miletus was despatched in three days, if Paul sailed from Patara on the next day, and the passage thence to Tyre was accomplished in six days, there would remain eight days for the *πλείους ἡμέρας* at Cæsarea. There is no impossibility in this. That a part of the passage, viz. that to Patara, was quick, we know; that the second stage of it was fortunate beyond expectation, we know from what ensued. Paul could not otherwise have had so many days remaining to devote to the calls of friendship at Tyre, Ptolemais and Cæsarea. Thus Paul reached Jerusalem, as he had desired, at the Pentecost (Acts 20: 16), and was there cast into prison. The time between his departure from Ephesus and his imprisonment at Jerusalem, between passover and passover, was about a year.

These were the intermediate events between Paul's mission from Antioch in respect to the Jewish observances and his seizure at Jerusalem. As we have seen, a part of them are accompanied with designations of time; and in regard to a part of them the time may be inferred with probable accuracy from circumstances. All together fill up the *period of seven years*. The mission we have mentioned occurred in the twelfth year of Claudius; proceeding from this point and reckoning seven years, we come to the fifth year of Nero.

#### § 84.

In the 7th year of Nero Felix was deposed from his station. Paul had spent two years in prison under Felix (Acts 24: 27), and was consequently apprehended in the fifth year of Nero. This coincides exactly with the reckoning in the preceding section. Festus called Paul before him, and, after some intervening incidents, sent him to Rome as he had desired.

It was late in the year; yet, on account of the variation of the Jewish months from the equations, till the intercalation made the year to coincide with the seasons, the time according to our reckoning cannot be exactly determined without tedious particularity. So much may be assumed as certain, that the fast of the seventh month fell as late as possible (Acts 27: 9), in which case it ended on the 2d of our October. The apostle was compelled to remain at Malta for three months through the winter (28: 11), i. e. till March, when the voyage was resumed. Thence

it continued without interruption; the apostle arrived at Rome in the spring of the eighth year of Nero's reign, remained there two whole years, and was released in the spring of Nero's tenth year. This was a fortunate release; for it was in the autumn of this same year that Nero's persecution broke out.

\* \* \* \* \*

It was the apostle's intention, as we see from some of the letters which he wrote from Rome, again to visit his friends in the east; and still in his Epistle to the Romans he had expressed a desire, after seeing Rome, to visit Spain.

One of the most ancient christian writings assures us that the latter voyage really took place. He went, we are told, to the western limits of the earth, ἐπὶ τέγμα δύνσεως, and after his return died ἐπὶ τῶν ἡγουμένων.<sup>1</sup> I do not see how any objection can be made to this statement of a man who was intimate with the apostle, who lived in Rome whence the journey was undertaken, unless, very unreasonably, the genuineness of the work be denied; especially as he wrote this account to the church at Corinth, and they would naturally know something of the fortunes of Paul, who but a short while before had lived and taught among them.

If, however, it be resolved that this work shall not be acknowledged as Clement's, its opponents do not gain much advantage. They cannot deny that, at any rate, the Epistle was in existence in the second century.<sup>2</sup> The author was certainly, therefore, as far as respects the period at which he wrote, in a situation to write from authentic tradition. Moreover, in the second century, the church at Corinth was in a condition to know whether the Epistle was genuine, and to reject it if it was not; yet, as late as the time of Eusebius, it was read annually in their assemblies, and thus each year they renewed their testimony to its genuineness.

Not only so, but as Eusebius states, it was read in his time in many other churches; and hence in the Alexandrian Codex, it is appended to the sacred writings by the first hand. This Ms. belongs to the fifth century, and was either executed at a time when it was customary to read the Epistle in public, or at all events was copied from a Ms. of that period.

The words ἐπὶ τῶν ἡγουμένων may be understood of the latter days of Nero, when Tigellinus and Nymphidius Sabinus administered affairs at their pleasure; also of the period after Nero's death until Sabinus resigned the sword to the former, and pretended to manage affairs for Galba till his arrival.<sup>3</sup> In this case the interpretation accords with other accounts, which assign the apostle's death to Nero's reign. At all events, no subsequent emperor had anything to do with it. A second interpretation, which supposes that by the words, ἐπὶ τῶν ἡγουμένων, the times of Galba, Otho and Vitellius are intended, confessedly deviates from other historical accounts.<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Clemens Rom. Ep. I. ad Corinth. sect. 5.

<sup>2</sup> Dionys. Corinth. apud Euseb. L. IV. c. 23.

<sup>3</sup> Plutarch in Galba. c. 8.

<sup>4</sup> The ancients do, indeed, specify Nero's reign, but with different designa-



The first mentioned voyage,<sup>1</sup> also, took place, at least in part. It falls in the order of time after his voyage to the west, and before his death, of which latter event it was the immediate occasion. Paul set out for the east, and went as far Corinth, where he met with Peter, whom he joined and accompanied to Rome. This is attested by Dionysius of Corinth: Peter and Paul, he says, met together in our city of Corinth, and went together to Italy, where they died martyrs to the cause of Christianity.<sup>2</sup> In the eleventh year of Nero, Peter was still in Asia, if it be a fact that his first Epistle from Babylon was occasioned by the horrors of Nero's persecution (see below, § 169). About this time Paul was on his voyage to the west; so that the two could not have met in Corinth before the twelfth year of Nero.

We will now give a tabular view of the history of the apostle Paul, according to the dates we have deduced, extending from his conversion to his liberation from imprisonment at Rome.

The middle of the XXIst year of Tiberius, or the 21st—22d, corresponds with the commencement of the thirty-sixth of the Christian era . . . . . 36.

During this year occurred Paul's conversion.

The XXIIId and last year of Tiberius, and the first of Caius Cæsar, correspond with the thirty-eighth A. D. . . . . 38.

The IIInd year of Caius Cæsar . . . . . 39.

Paul escapes from Damascus, and goes to Jerusalem.

The beginning of the IVth year of Claudius Cæsar . . . . . 45.

Paul's first mission from Antioch to Jerusalem.

The XIIth year of Claudius . . . . . 53.

Paul's second mission from Antioch to Jerusalem.

The XIIIth year of Claudius . . . . . 54.

Paul travels, at the close of winter, through Asia Minor to Europe, as far as Corinth; preaches here in the following autumn.

The XVth year of Claudius . . . . . 55.

Paul stays at Corinth through the winter and spring, till the next autumn.

The Ist year of Nero . . . . . 56.

Paul at Corinth in the winter; in the spring embarks for Asia; arrives in Jerusalem at Pentecost; then goes to Antioch.

The IIId year of Nero . . . . . 57.

Paul passes the winter at Nicopolis; goes to Ephesus; teaches there.

of time. The most precise statement which I meet with is in Jerome (Script. Eccles. V. Paulus). "Hic ergo decimo quarto Neronis anno, eodem die quo Petrus, Romæ capite truncatus . . . anno post passionem Domini tricesimo septimo."

<sup>1</sup> The author here refers to Paul's voyage to the east to visit his friends. The reference is very obscure; only "das Erste" is used, though so long an interval has elapsed since his mention of the two voyages to the east and west. See p. 502.—T<sub>R</sub>.

<sup>2</sup> In Euseb. H. E. L. II. c. 25.

The III <sup>d</sup> year of Nero . . . . .	58.
Paul preaches at Ephesus.	
The IV <sup>th</sup> year of Nero . . . . .	59.
Paul is at Ephesus and in Asia till Pentecost ; embarks for Macedonia.	
The V <sup>th</sup> year of Nero . . . . .	60.
Paul winters in Achaia ; returns to Jerusalem at Pentecost ; is imprisoned.	
The VI <sup>th</sup> year of Nero . . . . .	61.
Paul in bonds at Cæsarea.	
The VII <sup>th</sup> year of Nero . . . . .	62.
Paul in bonds at Cæsarea ; in autumn is sent to Rome.	
The VIII <sup>th</sup> year of Nero . . . . .	63.
Paul arrives at Rome in the spring ; is in bonds there.	
The IX <sup>th</sup> year of Nero . . . . .	64.
Paul is in bonds at Rome.	
The X <sup>th</sup> year of Nero . . . . .	65.
Paul is liberated in the spring.	

A few words in explanation of this table. In the XV<sup>th</sup> year of the reign of Tiberius, when the baptism of Jesus took place, he was about thirty years of age (Luke 3: 23, *ὡσεὶ ἐτῶν τριάκοντα ἀρχόμενος*). This designation of time I assume to be correct without further investigation ; for a proper discussion of the point would require a separate work. The baptism occurred about fifty or sixty days before the first passover, forty of which were taken up by the abode in the desert, and the remainder by the earlier occurrences at Bethany and in Galilee (John 1: 29—2: 13). These fifty or sixty days before the passover must have commenced in the month of February. This month, however, fell about the middle of the fifteenth year of the reign of Tiberius. For Augustus, from whose death the accession of Tiberius must be reckoned, died on the nineteenth of August.<sup>1</sup> From the middle of February to the middle of August are six months, and thus six months more are wanting to complete the year.

Tiberius died in the twenty-third year of his detested reign, on the sixteenth of March.<sup>2</sup> If the thirtieth year of Jesus began in the middle of the fifteenth year of Tiberius, i. e. in February, the thirty-eighth year of the Christian era must have begun in the middle of the twenty-third. Since, as we have before said, Tiberius died in March, he lived but one month in this thirty-eighth year A. D. This year,

<sup>1</sup> Dio Cassius. L. LVI. p. 590. Wechel. says : *τῇ ἐννέα καὶ δεκάτῃ τοῦ Αἰγούστου*. Sueton. In Aug. c. 100. says the same, according to the Roman way of reckoning "decimâ quartâ Kal. Septembris."

<sup>2</sup> Tacit. L. VI. Ann. c. 50. Sueton. Tiber. c. 73. Eutrop. c. 11. agree as to the date XVII. Kal. April. ; but Dio Cass. read by mistake VII. Kal. for XVII. Kal. *τῇ ἑκτῇ καὶ εἰκοστῇ τοῦ Μαρτίου ἡμέρᾳ*, L. 58. fin. The statement of Josephus (B. J. L. II. c. 9. n. 5), is very precise : *ἔτη δύο πρὸς εἰκοσι καὶ τρεῖς ἡμέρας ἐπὶ μηνὶν ἕξ*.

therefore, continued into the first of Caius Cæsar, and the second of his reign was the thirty-ninth of the Christian era.

Caius did not complete the fourth year of his reign; he ascended the throne in March, and died on the twenty-fourth of January.<sup>1</sup> This, however, makes but little difference as to the year of the Christian era, which continues on uniformly under his successor.

Claudius now took the throne and held it for thirteen years, and a part of the fourteenth, till the middle of October.<sup>2</sup> The year of Nero's reign, therefore, which begins at that time, begins three months and some days earlier than the Christian year.

## CHAPTER II.

### THE APOSTLE PAUL'S WRITINGS.

#### § 85.

Saul, שָׁאוּל, or Paul, which latter name he took either because he was going among Greeks, or in memory of the first illustrious person who gave him a favorable reception, and was converted by his means,<sup>3</sup> viz. Sergius Paulus, the Proconsul of Cyprus (for the name occurs first on this occasion, Acts 13: 9), was a Roman citizen, born at Tarsus in Cilicia, a city which in the days of Strabo<sup>4</sup> stood by the side of Athens and Alexandria, as respected the sciences and arts.

In conformity with the ancient Jewish proverb, "He who does not teach his son some trade, brings him up to steal," he learned the trade of a manufacturer of tent-cloth.<sup>5</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Sueton. in Cai. c. 58. "Nono Kal. Febr." and c. 59. "Imperavit triennio, et decem mensibus, diebus octo." Josephus, B. J. L. II. c. 11. probably confounded *diebus octo* with *μῆνας ὀκτώ*.

<sup>2</sup> Sueton. Claud. c. 45. "Excessit III. Idus Octobris." Comp. Tacit. Ann. XII. 69. Dio, L. LXI. cap. penult. gives the date correctly: *μετήλλαξε τῇ τριτῇ καὶ δεκάτῃ τοῦ ὀκτωβρίου*.

<sup>3</sup> Hieronym. in Catal. v. Paulus: "Quumque primum ad prædicationem ejus Sergius Paulus, proconsul Cypri, credidisset, ab eo, quod eum Christi fidei subjugarat, sortitus est nomen Paulus." Origen. Præf. in Ep. ad Rom. T. IV. p. 460. Ed. Ruei.

<sup>4</sup> Strabo, Geog. L. XIV. p. 463. Ed. Casaub. 1587. fol.

<sup>5</sup> Σκηνοποιός, Acts 18: 3. Michaelis infers from this expression that he was a mechanist, on the ground that, according to Pollux, σκηνοποιός was equivalent to μηχανοποιός in the old comedy: τοὺς δὲ μηχανοποιούς καὶ σκηνοποιούς ἡ παλαιὰ κωμῳδία ἀνόμαζεν (Ed. Grynæi, Col. 415). But the learned man has misunderstood this author. He is speaking here only of the theatre and its machines; the expression, ἡ παλαιὰ κωμῳδία, is used merely to denote the technical language of the actors. In this way, in a passage precisely parallel, the expression

He very early showed uncommon asperity of character, and the most obdurate intolerance. These traits he exhibited while but a youth, at the stoning of Stephen (Acts 7: 58. 8: 1, 2, 3).

His disposition developed itself without restraint, and even under public approbation, in wanton cruelty. He became furious, entered into houses to search for Christians, dragged forth men and women, and committed them to prison (8: 1—4). But his sphere of operations soon appeared to him too contracted. Jerusalem was not large enough to satisfy his sanguinary disposition. He presented himself before the Sanhedrim, and desired permission to persecute the Christians at Damascus, and on the road thither, and with inhuman satisfaction he cast persons of every age and of both sexes into prison (11: 1, 2. 22: 4 seq.).

This extremely violent man, with such terrible qualities of mind, whose strong ambition made him very bold and enterprising, would have become a perfect John of Gischala, a blood-thirsty zealot (ἐμπνέων ἀπειλῆς καὶ φόβου, Acts 9: 1), had not an unexpected event changed his whole character.

### § 86.

The harsh bent of his mind inclined him to the tenets of the Pharisees, who had all the recommendation of austerity, and were the dominant party among the Jews.

His literary education he received in part from Gamaliel, a teacher in great estimation at that time (Acts 22: 3). By him he was instructed in the Jewish laws and traditions, πατρικὰς παραδόσεις. His talents

---

ἡ νέα and ἡ ἀρχαία κωμωδία are used : ἡ δὲ νέα κωμωδία καὶ προσωποποιὸν εἰρημνεν, ὃν ἡ ἀρχαία σκευοποιὸν ἐκάλεν (Col. 91. Comp. Schol. minor. in Sophocl. Ajac. Ed. Brunck. ad v. 3). For the machinery which presented to view the *deus ex machina* was connected with the scenery and was a part of it, as is stated by the same Lexicographer, Περὶ μέτρων θεάτρου (Col. 229). Both, therefore, might be the work of the same artist; whence he was called indiscriminately sometimes the machine-maker and sometimes the scene-maker, as according to the second passage the artist was called at one time the mask-maker, and at another the maker of all the decorations etc. used in the theatre. The manufacture of theatrical machinery was certainly not Paul's business. The fathers called him σκηνοπόλιος and σκηνοδόχος, manufacturer of skin-tents (Suicer. Thesaur. Philol. p. 982). It would seem that the nature of the military tents led them to suppose him a worker in leather; for these were made of the skins of animals, whence the expression among the ancients: *exercitum sub pellibus habere, pellibus continere militem*. The native country of the apostle affords us most information in regard to his business. It produced very shaggy and rough-haired goats; whence *Κιλικίος τράχος* was a proverbial expression to denote one who was extremely deficient in good manners. From the hair of these animals the inhabitants of Cilicia manufactured a thick, coarse cloth, which was hence called *cilicium*, *cilicium*, *κίλικιον*: *Κιλικίος τράχος, ὃ δασυῖ, τοιοῦτοι γὰρ ἐν Κιλικίᾳ γίνονται τράχοι, ὅθεν καὶ τὰ ἐκ τῶν τρῶχων σκευαζόμενα κίλικια καλοῦνται* (Suidas. Comp. Hesych. and Salmas. in Solinum. p. 347). As to its use in war and in navigation, see Veget. De re militari, L. IV. c. 6. and Servius in Georg. L. III. v. 112. It was used, in particular, by the Nomades in Syria and on the Euphrates, for herdsmen's tents. Plin. H. Nat. L. VI. c. 28. "Nomades, infestioresque Chaldaeorum scenitæ . . . et ipsi vagi, sed a tabernaculis cognominati, quæ cilicis metantur, ubi libuit." Paul's business was the manufacture of this article of national industry. He was a manufacturer of tent-cloth.



promised a capable and persevering scholar, and the result justified the expectation. He understood all the modes of interpreting the bible which were then current, viz. allegory, typology, accommodation, and tradition. In Greek literature, too, he was far from being a novice (Acts 17: 28. 1 Cor. 15: 33. Tit. 1: 12).

Nor had nature denied him the external gifts which are so essential to eloquence, although he speaks of them with great modesty. At Lystra he was taken for the God of oratory.

### § 87.

This character, capable of great things, but not master of itself from the predominance of feeling, was an extreme in human nature, and was of course developed in extremes. His religion was a destructive zeal; his anger, ferocity; his fury demanded victims. So boisterous and ungovernable a disposition did not qualify him, in a *psychological* point of view, to be a christian, or even a philanthropist; least of all to be a meekly-suffering man. Yet all this he was on his conversion to Christianity, and his violent passions were softened down to a well-regulated and noble character.

Once hasty and passionate, now only courageous and determined; once violent, now energetic and enterprising; once vehemently opposing every thing which stood in his way, now only persevering; once savage and gloomy, now only serious; once cruel, now only strict; once a harsh zealot, now pious; once unrelenting, unsusceptible of sympathy and commiseration, now himself bathed in tears, which formerly he had seen in others unmoved. Formerly the friend of no one, now the brother of all mankind, philanthropic, compassionate, sympathetic; yet never weak, always great, manly and noble, even in the midst of sorrow and trouble. Thus he appears on occasion of his affecting departure from Miletus (Acts 20:); it is like the farewell of Moses, or the resignation of Samuel, tender and moving, full of self-respect, dignified, though painful.

Thus it was not the case merely that his mind received another bias and his ever-restless fervor was directed to a new object; but the propensities and passions of his hitherto unrestrained nature were brought into perfect symmetry; so that his vast powers were harmoniously adjusted to a new mental character. The loftiness of this character arises from its perfect unity.

Now if, as is clear, this was the result of his conversion, every one may judge for himself whether such a change be a mark of a disordered brain, or shows that with more than ordinary qualities of mind he carefully guided his conduct by regular principles. We can then, too, readily answer the inquiry, How far his interest in the Christian cause was real, firmly rooted in his mind and conscience?

### § 88.

His writings are a faithful expression of the character we have described. They evince an independent mind, whose conceptions and ideas, as well as his mode of communicating and stating them, were

peculiarly his own. Even the same thought, occurring at different times in his writings, always receives a new turn, has each time something novel in its aspect. In the matter and the style we discover a brisk, active mind, possessed of a well-digested store of ideas, and a remarkable felicity of communication.

So, too, in regard to the tone of his writings. Sternness, manly earnestness, and strong feeling, alternate with mildness, kindness, and sympathy; and the transitions are such as would naturally take place in the breast of a man deeply interested in his subject, of a noble and intelligent character. He warns, rebukes, and then consoles; he assails with vigour, presses with impetuosity, then speaks with evident kindness of heart, exhibits his ardent desire for the welfare of others, his forbearance, his dread of afflicting any. All is just as the subject, the time, the character of those whom he writes, and other circumstances, demand.

We find every where importunate language, an earnest and animated manner. Rom. 1: 26—32 is a comprehensive and powerful description of character. His antitheses (Rom. 2: 21—24. 2 Cor. 4: 8—12. 6: 9—11. 11: 22—30), his enumerations (1 Cor. 13: 4—10. 2 Cor. 6: 4—7. 2 Tim. 3: 1—5. Ephes. 4: 4—7. 5: 3—6), his climaxes (Rom. 8: 29, 30. Tit. 3: 3, 4), his questions, exclamations, and comparisons, give animation to his style, often to a very striking degree. The simile in 1 Cor. 12: 14 seq. resembles that of Menenius Agrippa, and is even more elegant and expressive.

Still he bestowed little pains on the correction of his style. His thoughts and feelings remained as they were thrown off from his pen. We see no trace of the file, or of that artist-like care with which the ancients were wont to give the finishing touch to their productions. Hence his phraseology is frequently negligent, his construction incomplete, or even obscure, full of parentheses, and these sometimes very long. See 1 Tim. 1: 4, from *θεοῦ τὴν ἐν πίστει* to v. 18, *ταύτην τὴν παραγγελίαν*; 2 Cor. 3: 14—18. 4: 7—9. Ephes. 2: 1—5. Rom. 2: 13—16. 12: 4—15, etc. etc.

### § 89.

Notwithstanding these rhetorical faults, I regard Paul as a master of eloquence, and should even like to compare him in this respect with celebrated men of ancient times, e. g. with Isocrates, whose letters to Demonicus, and some of those to Nicocles, bear considerable resemblance to Paul's in design and purport. I said in respect to eloquence; for, though the Jewish-Greek dialect of the apostle be far inferior to the Attic euphony of Isocrates, he exhibits an eloquence independent of art, which was the result of his talents and character, of conviction, interest in his subjects, and deep impressions of their nature and importance, and which, from the influence of these causes, reached a degree of grandeur scarcely ever attained by art. I cannot, however, here pursue this parallel, and willingly leave every reader to his own judgment in regard to it; but I must not omit to notice the opinion of a critic whose impartiality and ability give him claims to especial consideration.

I mean Dionysius Longinus, who gives his estimate of the apostle's eloquence in the following passage. "The following men are the boast of all eloquence and of Grecian genius, viz. Demosthenes, Lysias, Æschines, Hyperides, Isæus, Dinarchus, or Demosthenes Crithinus, Isocrates, and Antiphon; *to whom may be added Paul of Tarsus, who was the first, within my knowledge, that did not make use of demonstration.*"

I am aware that the latter part of this passage has been regarded as suspicious by illustrious critics, by Fabricius and Ruhnken;<sup>1</sup> but I think something further may be urged with propriety in its favor, particularly as these two learned men rejected it rather from mere critical suspicion than on good grounds.

We must first examine the use of terms in the passage. Paul is said to have made use of the *δόγματος ἀναποδείκτου*. Longinus distinguished in rhetoric the *ἀποδεικτικόν* from τῷ κατὰ φαντασίαν ἐκπληκτικῷ, the *genus demonstrativum* from that which appealed merely to the passions.<sup>2</sup> In speaking, therefore, of rhetorical matters, as in this passage, *δόγμα ἀναπόδεικτον* means a style rather of a stirring than an argumentative nature.<sup>3</sup> Moreover, the expression *προΐσταςθαι δόγματος*, which is unusual, is one elsewhere employed by Longinus. It occurred in his work *Περὶ τέλους*, written against Plotinus and Amelius, a fragment of which has been preserved by Porphyry: οὐκ ὀλίγοι τῶν ἐν φιλοσοφίᾳ λόγων προέστησαν.<sup>4</sup>

The passage, too, sounds very naturally in the mouth of a heathen philosopher. Paul seemed to the critic rather to persuade than to demonstrate. Nor was this without reason; for the apostle either assumes certain doctrines as well known, and then connects others with them, or makes use of passages from the Old Testament, the argumen-

<sup>1</sup> Fabric. Biblioth. Græc. L. IV. p. 445. Ed. Hamb. Ruhnkenius in Not. ad Rutil. Lupum De figur. sentent. p. 88. I cite the passage in Longinus according to the amendment of Ruhnken. In the usual editions it occupies the first place among the fragments. Κορωνίς δ' ἔστω λόγον παντός καὶ φρονήματος Ἑλληνικοῦ Δημοσθένους, Ἀσίας, Αἰσχίνης, Ὑπερίδης, Ἰσαῖος, Δεινάρχου, Δημοσθένους ὁ κρίθινος, Ἰσοκράτης, Ἀντίφων· πρὸς τοῦτοις Παῦλος ὁ Ταρσεὺς, ὅτινα καὶ πρῶτον φημι προΐσταςθαι δόγματον ἀναποδείκτον. It is well known that Dinarchus was facetiously called *Δημοσθένους κρίθινος* and *ἄγριος*; it ought therefore to be made apparent that these words are only a surname of Dinarchus, lest the reader should suppose two different persons were meant. This is not done in Ruhnken's amendment. Before the time of Ruhnken, the text even contained the following awkward blunder. The name of Isocrates was inserted between Dinarchus and Demosthenes Crithinus: Δεινάρχου, Ἰσοκράτης, Δημοσθένους κρίθινος. Perhaps the text once was: Δεινάρχου, ἴσως κατ' ἐπίκλην Δημοσθένους ὁ κρίθινος, Ἰσοκράτης. The words after Δεινάρχου were supposed to be the name Ἰσοκράτης. This was therefore expunged after κρίθινος, as having occurred before; and thus originated the reading we have mentioned.

<sup>2</sup> Περὶ ὕψ. XV. n. 11.

<sup>3</sup> In the language of the learned of ancient times, τὸ ἀναπόδεικτον is generally that which is not sustained by argument, or a position taken for granted, κατὰ συγχώρησιν λαμβανόμενον, for the purpose of drawing inferences from it (Sextus Empir. Pyrrhon. iHypoth. L. II. c. 6. n. 54, and L. II. c. 15. n. 168). Morus assumes this expression to be an interpolation, when he attempts to explain it from the usage of christian writers (Lib. animadv. in Longin. p. 54).

<sup>4</sup> Longin. ex edit. Mori. p. 277 and 264.

tative force of which the heathen writer did not perceive, and which he must therefore have regarded as mere erudition and literary embellishment. In his situation, therefore, he could not make a more correct observation in regard to Paul, than that he was the first who made use of persuasion and pathos rather than argument.

The internal grounds of judgment, then, the phraseology and the sentiment, are so far from being in favor of the supposed interpolation, that they rather point to our author. So likewise with the external evidence.

Dionysius Longinus was of the sect of the New Platonists, who were pretty well acquainted with the Christian Scriptures. Porphyry, his pupil, in his fifteen books against the Christians, does not merely attack the general purport of the New Testament, but selects and analyzes particular passages. Amelius, a contemporary of Longinus, endeavored to prove that John's Gospel contained the Platonic doctrine in regard to the Logos.<sup>1</sup>

In the time of Longinus the Christians had public religious worship in the dominions of his pupil and friend, Zenobia, and Paul of Samosata, Bishop of Antioch, was known and favored at her court, so that the critic must have been intimately acquainted with him. There is even strong probability<sup>2</sup> that they were natives of the same city, Samosata, and perhaps acquainted with each other in early life; but, independently of this circumstance, the situation of the philosopher makes it clear that he must have had information respecting the christian scriptures.

Lastly, in his work on the Sublime (IX. 10), he makes honorable mention of the Mosaic book of Genesis. If the books of the Jews attracted his attention, those of the Christians could hardly escape his curiosity; and considering his impartial estimate of the former, we ought not to be surprised at the opinion of so fair a critic respecting the Apostle Paul.

### § 90.

Some will now expect me to specify the peculiarities of Paul's system of doctrine, and to acquaint them with the spirit of his writings; and others who do not go so far as this, will expect me to state the intermediate ideas by which he connected his tenets and united them into one complete system. Both, however, make requisitions which, if nothing else could be objected against them, are more easily made than met. I am apprehensive that as yet we are not enabled to distinguish properly between the scaffolding and the structure itself.

That, however, which is particularly observable in Paul, and which is the key to all his actions, is the remarkable impression which the idea of an universal religion had made on his mind. This sublime idea of retaining all that was excellent and divine in the religious opinions of a disowned and perishing people, and of perpetuating it in a system which not only far surpassed every thing of the time, but would through the

<sup>1</sup> Euseb. Præp. Evang. L. XI. Theodoret. De curand. Græc. aff. L. II.—Cyrill. Contra Julian. L. VIII.

<sup>2</sup> Hudson, Præf. in Longin. Oxon. 1718, proves from an ancient inscription that the family of Longinus resided at Samosata.



developments made of it in succeeding ages, satisfy all the wants of posterity, bearing this infallible mark of its truth, that it was adapted to all men and all times—this idea of founding a religion for the world, never penetrated any mind so deeply, never lighted up so much energy, or prompted such persevering effort.

In this matter he was no man's disciple; he received his spirit directly from his Master; a divine spark inflamed him. It was this which would not permit him to stay in Palestine or Syria; which irresistibly urged him to go to foreign lands. Judea and its vicinity were the province of his companions; but his mission was among the Gentiles; the whole heathen world was allotted to him. Hence he commenced his labors in the various countries of Asia Minor; and when even these limits became too narrow for him, he went with the same confidence to Europe, among other nations, institutions, customs and opinions; and here finally, with the same restless ardor, he extended his plans even to the pillars of Hercules.

Hence it was, that, though he carefully accommodated himself to the Jewish mode of teaching, he still yielded nothing essential, disapproved the pliability of Peter, and did not manifest the same forbearance as James; granting no indulgence to old attachment to Judaism, whenever opinions and institutions were in question which excluded other nations or individuals, and were not suited to all people and all times. Hence he violently attacked the Jewish constitution, and was proclaimed an enemy of Moses and the law, so that his life was put in jeopardy. It was this idea which gave a peculiar character to his whole course, and which pervades his writings throughout. In these writings we very frequently find his peculiar views on this subject concisely intimated.

Thus did Paul prepare the way for the destruction of two religions, that of his ancestors and that of the heathen. How well-timed his efforts were, it is not our business at present to inquire. We will set aside the question whether both religions were not still of some utility at that period. Poets may regret that the poetical religion of the Greeks, and that of the Romans, which was deeply indebted to the former, should have sunk in the lap of time with all their agreeable fictions; but it was in vain to think of guiding by the æsthetic feeling an age which was no longer Platonic, and subsequent events, which gradually developed themselves, the civilization of barbarous nations that had been molested by the Roman arms, required something different from Grecian fables, which under another than an Ionic or Attic sky could neither be appreciated nor comprehended.

But why was Paul's mode of teaching so thoroughly Jewish? Why did he envelop his discourse to such a degree in the learning of Palestine, while proclaiming an universal religion? His youthful education, the custom of the time, and the people before him, determined him to this mode of procedure. In every clime which he visited, he had to do first and foremost with Jews. Had he possessed what was termed by Socrates his obstetric art, the art of drawing forth to light the thoughts of the human mind from its inmost recesses; had he possessed the splendid style of Plato, or, considering him as an orator, the art of an hundred rhetoricians, he would hardly have gained a single Jew by it. With all this profane eloquence, wise men were but fools in the syna-

gogue. The Jews required in religious matters the language of religion, the learning, phraseology, turns of expression and images peculiar to their nation.

The fact that Paul met with heathen, likewise, in the synagogues of the Jews, was one of those circumstances of the time which were of great advantage to Christianity; for there was no other place where he could have appeared before them in the character of teacher. In the temples nothing was attended to but sacrifices; in the forum nothing but laws and lawsuits; and it can be ascribed only to the peculiar regulations of the city of Athens that he wrote and taught in public there. It may be said that perhaps it was only dissatisfaction with the established religion, or a propensity to superstition, which led these heathen to the synagogues. At all events, however, a great number of heathen were sincerely addicted to Judaism, and frequented the Sabbath assemblies.<sup>1</sup> In this way Christianity came to their ears, and then spread to their fellow-countrymen. They were termed *σεβόμενες*, and *μετuentes*, of whom Paul found many at Thessalonica, in particular.

But these, too, having imbibed the religious notions of the Jews, had during initiation become accustomed to their technical language and mode of teaching. Paul was, therefore, obliged to begin where others had left off, and to avail himself of what had been previously accomplished.

## § 91.

### FIRST EPISTLE TO THE THESSALONIANS.

Thessalonica, the capital of what, according to the division of Æmilius Paulus, was the second Macedonian district,<sup>2</sup> and the largest city in the whole country,<sup>3</sup> was eventually the residence of the Roman Prætor. It was very populous,<sup>4</sup> and also sufficiently wealthy to infuse courage into

<sup>1</sup> Josephus, B. J. L. II. c. 18. n. 2. and c. 20. n. 2. In Spon's "Voyage d'Italie, de Dalmatie, de Grèce et du Levant," Tom. I. p. 398. Ed. 1679, there is an inscription from Thyatira, by which it appears that an inhabitant of that place even provided for his burial in a garden near a synagogue: *ΦΑΒΙΟΣ ΖΟΣΙΜΟΣ ΚΑΤΑΣΚΕΥΑΣΑΣ ΣΟΡΟΝ ΕΘΕΤΟ ΕΠΙ ΤΟΠΟΥ ΚΑΘΑΡΟΥ ΟΝΤΟΣ ΠΡΟ ΤΗΣ ΠΟΛΕΟΣ ΠΡΟΣ ΤΩΙ ΣΑΜΒΑΘΕΙΩΙ ΕΝ ΤΩΙ ΧΑΛΛΑΙΟΥ ΠΕΡΙΒΟΛΩΙ* . . . A pertinent inscription which was found at Pola in Istria, is contained in Gruter's Thes. Inscript. p. 271. n. 11. *AUR. SOTER. ET AUR. STEPHANUS AUR. SOTERIAE MATRI PIENTISS. RELIGIONI JUDAICAE METUENTI*. There is a similar one in Apianus, Inscript. sacros. vetust. p. 358. I do not know whether it is contained in Gruter or not, as his work is not at hand. *RELIGIONI JUDAICAE METUENTI F. P. AELIUS PRISCILIANUS ET AELIA CHRESTE VIVI SIBI POSUERUNT* . . . We shall say more of this subject in treating of the Epistle to the Romans. We will merely subjoin here a remarkable passage from Dio Cassius: *Ἡ δὲ ἐπικλήσις αὐτῇ (Ἰουδαίος) ἐκείνοις μὲν οὐκ οἶδα πόθεν ἤρξατο γεῖνῃσθαι. Φέρει δὲ καὶ ἐπὶ τοὺς ἄλλους ἀνθρώπους, ὅσοι τὰ νόμιμα αὐτῶν, καίπερ ἄλλοι ἐθνεῖς ὄντες, ζηλοῦσι. κ. τ. λ.* L. XXXVII. p. 37. Ed. Wechel. 1606.

<sup>2</sup> Livius, L. XLV. 29.

<sup>3</sup> Lucian, Lucius sive asinus. *Πόλις τῶν ἐν Μακεδονίᾳ μεγίστη.*

<sup>4</sup> Strabo Geogr. L. VII. *Μάλιστα τῶν ἄλλων εὐανδροῦσα.*

the armies of Brutus and Cassius, which were promised the pillage of it as the reward of victory.<sup>1</sup> Even at the present day it is an important commercial city, and contains very many Jews.

Little of an honorable nature is known of the state of morals in this city. The females, particularly, could claim little credit on the score of modest, retiring demeanor, which is the greatest charm of the sex; this virtue was in so low estimation generally in this city, that the place was selected as the scene of the wanton fancies of the satirist.<sup>2</sup>

Soon after his first entrance into Europe, Paul made trial here of the doctrines of Christianity. He entered the synagogue, the only place where he, as a stranger, could address the people on the subject of religion and morality. He there spoke for three Sabbaths concerning the Christ, or Messiah, and proved from the Scriptures that he must needs have suffered, and have risen from the dead, and that Jesus was this Messiah (Acts 17: 2—9). The Jews were not pleased with these doctrines; but he had the consolation of gaining approbation and adherents among the Gentiles. For of these there were many *metuentes*, who visited the synagogue and had been initiated into Judaism, but had not the preconceived opinions and national waywardness of the Jews to prevent them from appreciating a better system.

These religious Gentiles adhered to the apostle, and believed, both men and women, in great numbers. The Jews did not remain indifferent at this loss; their jealousy was excited. They created an uproar, drove Paul and Silas from the city, and, after they had departed, wreaked all their fury on those who had embraced the apostle's doctrines.

The new converts had hardly enjoyed the most simple instruction, when Paul was compelled to betake himself to flight. Much, therefore, must have continued obscure to them, and respecting many parts of his preaching doubts must have arisen which there was no one to solve. From the outline of his preaching presented by Luke (Acts 17: 3—7), it appears that he occupied himself wholly with a discussion of the Messianic dignity of Jesus, which of course included his kingly office and his judicial authority over the world. But, according to Luke's account, on our own resurrection, as well as on many other subjects, he did not enlarge. It is plain, too, from what follows, that Paul took this ancient Jewish tenet for granted, or else did not touch upon it.

The expectation of a final judgment, to be conducted by the Messiah, was pleasing to many, because they hoped that the opponents of the doctrines which they professed, would soon be put to shame and the triumph of Christianity in the sight of all would procure them justice (2 Thess. 1: 6, 7). Circumstances gave additional liveliness to these hopes. They had severe persecutions to endure from the exasperated zealots of the law; they therefore longed the more ardently for the day of their glorification, and interpreted the preaching of the apostle according to their wishes, as signifying the speedy coming of our Lord.

Now, as they had received no information in regard to the resurrection, some of them could not help fearing that if this day should be long

<sup>1</sup> Appian, *De bell. civil.* L. IV. c. 118.

<sup>2</sup> Lucian, *Lucius sive asinus*, n. 50. 51. 52. T. VI. Bipont. p. 191.

delayed, they would not enjoy the happiness of seeing it and participating in the glorious event (1 Thess. 4: 13).

Others, however, were alarmed by the consideration that such a judgment would unveil their faults and strictly punish their failings; for many had not succeeded in divesting themselves of their old habits, especially those of lasciviousness and idleness.

### § 92.

The apostle was, as we have said, driven from Thessalonica, and went to Berea, an adjacent place (Acts 17: 10), where he was received with joy, but was soon discovered and persecuted anew by the Jews of Thessalonica. He fled thence also, leaving behind, however, Silas and Timotheus (Acts 17: 14). Timotheus, by the apostle's command, visited the Thessalonians once more from Berea (1 Thess. 3: 1, 2, 5), and Paul went to Athens, where he waited for his companions whom he had left behind (Acts 17: 15, 16). He was at Corinth, however, when they joined him (Acts 18: 5).

There Paul learned from them the condition and concerns of the church at Thessalonica, and formed the resolution of writing to encourage and console it. Hence, while Timotheus and Silvanus were with him (1 Thess. 1: 2), as soon as Timotheus had joined him, *ἄρτι ἐλθόντος Τιμοθέου* (1 Thess. 3: 6), consequently in the early part of his abode at Corinth, he wrote an epistle to them, the first of all his Epistles, according to the investigations made above in regard to the chronology of the Acts. It was therefore written in the thirteenth year of Claudius.

### § 93.

The contents are as follows: I commend your faith and constancy in suffering; in this you resemble me. I preached to you under persecution, without any benefit to myself, for your good (—2: 17). I have often longed after you, and I sent Timotheus in my stead to comfort you. He brought me joyful tidings. May God vouchsafe you strength to do right (—4: 1)! I must warn you, however, to flee fornication; ye have no need that I exhort you to beneficence; but let every one labor, being a burden to no one (—4: 13). Be not concerned that you may not live to see the coming of our Lord. Our hopes are not, like those of the heathen, bounded by this life; the dead will rise again to take part in Christ's coming. But no man knows the time of this event; therefore be ye always ready.

### § 94.

#### THE SECOND EPISTLE TO THE THESSALONIANS.

While they were anxiously looking for the coming of our Lord, they received the apostle's first Epistle. As he reproved some of their vices in it, the consciences of many made them less desirous, and even fearful,



of our Lord's coming. Soon after another epistle appeared, purporting to come from the apostle, which announced that our Lord's appearance was at hand; this only was needed to make them utterly miserable (2 Thess. 2: 2). It is true that this epistle was fictitious; but it had its full effect. It was probably written by one in their midst; for the author was acquainted with their condition, expectations, fears and hopes. It was, therefore, probably written rather with the desire of hastening an amendment in some of them, than with any evil intentions.

Paul soon learned this, and the consternation of the Thessalonians; he could not suffer them to continue longer in so wretched a condition. He was still at Corinth when in these circumstances he wrote his second Epistle to them; for Timotheus and Silas were yet with him (2 Thess. 1: 1. Acts 18: 5). Now these two men were deprived of his society at his departure from Corinth (Acts 18: 18), and it is not till a great while after, that we find the first of them again in his company, and the other, Silas, never again appears in it (19: 22).

It was, therefore, at Corinth, that he learned of this occurrence and the consternation of the Thessalonian Church; and from this city he wrote his second Epistle for their consolation, in the fourteenth year of Claudius.

### § 95.

I thank God, he writes, that your faith and constancy under persecution increase. Jesus will entirely requite you and your enemies at the day of his coming (—2:). Be not terrified at anything, not even by an epistle in my name as though the Lord were at hand. Idolatry must reach her highest pitch of arrogance before the punishment comes (2: 12). But we, brethren, thank God that he has appointed us unto glory; be steadfast in the faith; pray for God's assistance (—3: 6). There are, however, disorderly persons among you, particularly indolent persons; separate yourselves from them, if they will not amend. I subjoin the salutation with mine own hand, for your assurance in future. The grace of God be with you.

### § 96.

#### THE EPISTLE TO TITUS.

Paul went from Corinth, where he wrote the two last-mentioned Epistles, to Ephesus. There he abode several weeks, and composed this letter of instruction to his son Titus.

The apostle speaks of having left Titus behind at Crete (Tit. 1: 5). Now, of all his voyages, this is the only one in which he can have visited Crete.

The first time he left Syria to go abroad among the nations, he directed his course to the provinces of Asia Minor, and returned by land to Antioch. When he departed again, he took the same course, passed through the same countries, and went to Troas, whence he visited Macedonia, and came to Athens and Corinth.

On leaving this latter city, he embarked in its eastern harbor, Cenchrea, with the purpose of sailing to Syria (Acts 18: 18). On this occasion only, did his course lie so near Crete that he might have visited it. We cannot tell whether the ship in which he embarked made this circuit or whether he was cast upon the island. If the latter was the case, he encountered one of those perils by sea which he mentions in 2 Cor. chap. 11.

When he again left the main land of Asia, he went to Macedonia, and returned by the way of Troas (Acts 20: 1 seq.), whence he embarked for Miletus. But all the places in this voyage are so precisely stated, that we know his course exactly; he came to Miletus not long after mid-day, and did not approach Crete at all (20: 13—16). Hence his visit to this island must have been made during the voyage undertaken by him from Corinth to Syria, which carried him, however, to Ephesus.

Other circumstances, moreover, which point to this voyage, confirm the position we have taken. At the same time that Paul arrived at Ephesus, a certain Jew was there, named Apollos, who was intending to go to Achaia, and for this purpose obtained letters of recommendation from the brethren (Acts 18: 24, 27). Now, in this Epistle of the apostle, we find mention of an Apollos, who is on a journey, and an injunction to Titus to help him forward in it (Tit. 3: 13).

If this be the same Apollos who is spoken of in the Acts, as all the circumstances denote, we may see from his example that the circuitous route from Ephesus to Corinth, or *vice versâ*, by way of Crete, was not unusual; whether it was occasioned by commercial or other reasons.

But an important difficulty lies against the supposition that the Acts and the Epistle to Titus refer to the same journey of Apollos. The Acts concludes the account of Paul's residence at Ephesus by saying, that he bade farewell and departed for Palestine, and travelled through Galatia and Phrygia, confirming the brethren in the faith, (18: 21, 22, 23). It is not till after Luke has said this, that he speaks of Apollos, who, therefore, it may be said, must have arrived after Paul's departure, and could not have seen him, much less obtained any letter of recommendation from him. So it would seem at first view; but when we take into consideration what is said soon after in the Acts, the case is altered again. "It came to pass that while Apollos was at Corinth, Paul, having passed through the upper coasts, came to Ephesus" (19: 1). Now what induced the historian to recur again to Apollos, and to begin by mentioning him, when about to speak of Paul? Plainly, he designed, by a comparison with the arrival of Apollos at Corinth, to fix with more precision the time when the apostle travelled through the upper countries and came to Ephesus the second time. But, it is said, this is not exactly the sense of the words, *διελθόντα τὰ ἀνωτεριὰ μέρη ἐλθεῖν εἰς Ἐφῆσον*. Is it imagined that they signify *μετὰ τὸ διελθεῖν—ἦλθεν*, after having travelled through, he came to Ephesus? In that case the phraseology must have been, *διελθυσθότα—ἐλθεῖν*, which would have included the sense of *μετὰ*, denoting the pluperfect. On the contrary the words *διελθόντα—ἐλθεῖν* signify merely *διῆλθεν καὶ ἦλθεν*; both occurrences belong to the same period, and are not so distinguished in point of time that one is represented as longer past than the other. The sense, therefore, is this: *While Apollos was at*

*Corinth, Paul passed through the upper coasts and came to Ephesus.* Now if this journey was not taken till Apollos reached Corinth, the departure of Apollos to Corinth and that of Paul to Syria must have occurred at about the same time. And what then? They must, therefore, have met at Ephesus, whence they sailed, one to Corinth and the other to Syria.

Is it asked how this can be reconciled with Titus 3: 12? In an uncommonly simple and natural manner, as I imagine. Paul writes to Titus as follows: "When I shall send Artemas unto thee, or Tychicus (who was of the province of Asia, in the capital of which Paul wrote the Epistle (Acts 20: 4), and who probably accompanied him to Jerusalem), be diligent to come unto me to Nicopolis; for I have determined there to winter." The apostle went from Ephesus to keep the feast at Jerusalem; thence he went to Antioch, and after some time departed from that city, and went through Upper Asia, Galatia and Phrygia, to Ephesus again. He past the winter, therefore, somewhere in Asia Minor. Now it is well known that there was a town named Nicopolis between Antioch and Tarsus, the birth-place of the apostle.<sup>1</sup> At Nicopolis he was about equally distant from two cities which were dear to him, and it was on his way to the upper countres. In going from Antioch through Cilicia, he could not but pass through or near this town. Now Titus knew from the route which the apostle had taken, which of the many cities of this name was meant. Indeed, this Nicopolis was better known to him than any other, as he was of Asiatic descent. At least, he was Paul's pupil, *γνήσιον τέκνον* (Tit. 1: 4), and closely connected with him, before the apostle had visited Europe (Gal. 2: 1—6).

### § 97.

It was the business of Titus in Crete to bring to maturity the seeds which the apostle had there sown; a difficult commission among so degenerate a people. Not a single Cretan possessed all the virtues which Paul in this Epistle to Titus requires in an elder of the church, and the people generally were addicted to all the vices which he reproves. The Epistle has a very exact local application, and almost every sentence in it might be illustrated and confirmed from classic authors. We will here specify only the more prominent traits in the character of this people.

Nature had conferred on this island every thing which tends to make man happy. In ancient times, moreover, the inhabitants possessed a renowned political constitution, which has often been placed by the side of that of Sparta; but at this period, and indeed much earlier, their institutions and morals had sunk extremely low.

The people were of an unsteady character, prone to quarrels, civil

<sup>1</sup> Strabo L. XIV. p. 465. Ed. Casaub. fol. 1587. This is the Nicopolis in the *Συνέκδημος* of Hierocles (p. 660), which perplexed Wesseling so much. Vet. Roman. Itiner. Amstelod. 1735. Steph. Byzant. V. "Ἰσσοῦ. Πόλις μεταξὺ Συρίας καὶ Κιλικίας, ἐφ' ἣν Ἀλέξανδρος Ἀρρεῖον ἐνίκησε, ἣ ἐκλήθη διὰ τοῦτο Νικόπολις ἐπ' αὐτοῦ. Eustath. *Παρεκβολ.* in Dionys. Perieget. v. 119.

commotions and broils, to robbery and violence.<sup>1</sup> Avaricious and sordid to an excessive degree, they regarded nothing as base which gratified their greediness of gain.<sup>2</sup> Hence their want of veracity, their treacherous and deceitful disposition, which had become a common by-word.<sup>3</sup> Even when their morals were purest, they were strongly addicted to wine;<sup>4</sup> and their licentiousness is frequently mentioned and denounced by the ancients.

τῆς ἅπαντ' ἐχούσης  
Κρήτης, ὅπου πόλεσσιν  
ἔρωσ' ἐποργιάζει . . .

Religion itself gave rise to many of the excesses of this people. Many of the gods were born in this island. They even pointed out their sepulchres and catacombs, and they celebrated the festivals and mysteries of them all. Hence holidays, recreation, and idleness, were perpetual among them. One of their own poets, called *θεολόγος* by Diodorus, gave testimony against them, which testimony was corroborated by Paul (1: 12).

Jews, too, had settled amongst them, who, to all appearance, improved but little here in point of morals.<sup>5</sup> The apostle seems to have regarded them as worse than the native inhabitants.

### § 98.

Such were the circumstances under which Titus was to establish a christian church. To the young teacher, left alone to perform this difficult office, nothing could be more acceptable than precepts and rules of conduct from his wiser instructor. These Paul furnished him in this Epistle, of which we can only give a very general outline. He first describes the qualities which should be possessed by elders of the church, the vices from which they should be free and which they should most earnestly combat (1:—2:). Then the virtues to be expected of the aged women and of the female sex in general, and also the instruction to be given to servants. He exhorts him likewise to be himself an example, and to inculcate universal amendment on the part of the followers of Jesus (—3:). He admonishes him to inculcate obedience, moderation and forbearance, and to avoid all foolish disputes and unprofitable speculations. In conclusion, he commends to his good offices certain persons who were travelling; and appoints Nicopolis as a place of meeting.

<sup>1</sup> Polyb. L. VI. 46. *Διὰ τὴν ἔμμετον σφίσι πλεονεξίαν ἐν πλείστοις ἰδία καὶ κατὰ κοινὸν σιάσσει καὶ φόβοις καὶ πολέμοις ἐμφυλίοις ἀναστρεφόμενοι.*

<sup>2</sup> Loc. cit. *Καθόλου δ' ὁ περὶ τὴν αἰσχροκέρδειαν καὶ πλεονεξίαν τρόπος . . . ἐπιχωριάζει παρ' αὐτοῖς.*

<sup>3</sup> *Πρὸς Κρήτα κρητίειν.* Suidas. Plutarch in *Æmil. Paul.* T. I. p. 488. Henr. Steph. Polyb. VIII. 21 and 18. *Κρής ἐπάρχων, καὶ φύσει ποικίλος.* Zenodot. Proverb. v. *κρητίζειν.*

<sup>4</sup> They even regarded *τὴν ἐν τοῖς οἴνοις πολλὴν διατριβὴν* as of advantage to them (Plato de Legg. L. I. Vol. VIII. p. 38. Bipont).

<sup>5</sup> Philo, Legat. ad Caium. Edit. Turneb. p. 725.



## § 99.

## THE EPISTLE TO THE GALATIANS.

Paul wrote the Epistle to Titus at Ephesus, and went from thence to Syria and Palestine; he had promised, however, to come again to Ephesus, and did so. He returned thither through Galatia and Phrygia, and after his visit to the Galatians wrote them this Epistle for urgent reasons. It was written either on the road to Ephesus, or, as is more probable, at Ephesus (Acts 18: 23), in the second year of Nero.

He had indeed preached to them before (Acts 16: 6), after he had attended the council of apostles and elders at Jerusalem and then departed again to go among the Gentiles. The subject of his instruction was the decree of this council respecting certain Jewish rites (Acts 16: 4, 6). This decree did, indeed, liberate the Gentiles from the observance of the law, but, from tenderness towards the Jews, did not declare its abrogation or inutility, and even suffered the preachers of Moses to pursue their employment without opposition (15: 20, 21). In this spirit Paul preached among the Galatians, and with success, not even meeting with any hindrance on the part of the Jews resident in the country. The state of things was for the present quiet, and the Epistle cannot have been composed directly after this visit.

It was written, then, after the second visit, when he went to Ephesus through Galatia and Phrygia; for he speaks in the Epistle as though a second visit had taken place. He distinguishes an earlier and a later by the words: *εὐηγγελισάμην ὑμῖν τὸ πρῶτον* (Gal. 4: 13). This could be said only in allusion to a visit subsequent to this first. Of this earliest visit, and the instruction which he communicated to them during it, he says, that he then made allowance for human weakness, *δι' ἀσθενειαν τῆς σαρκὸς εὐηγγελισάμην*, in order not to give offence by stricter preaching. He then contrasts this preaching with a different species, in which he told them the plain truth, and remarks the opposite effects of the two modes. They heard him gladly, when he exercised indulgence towards them, but when he told them the truth without reserve, they became inimical to him (4: 16), *ὥστε ἐχθρὸς ὑμῶν γέγονα, ἀληθεύων ὑμῖν*.

From these indications, the Epistle must have been written after the second visit; not long after, however, because this change in their feelings is said to have taken place soon, *ταχέως* (1: 6).<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Dr. Koppe (Nov. Test. Perpet. Adnot. Illustr. Vol. VI. Ed. Tychsen. p. 8, 9) is desirous of making out an earlier journey to Galatia than those mentioned in Acts 16: 6 and 18: 22. His reasons are as follows. First; Barnabas was known to the Galatians (Galat. 2: 13). Now they did not become acquainted with him on occasion of either of the two journeys above mentioned; for he had before separated from Paul (Acts 15: 36—39). It must therefore have been at an earlier period. Secondly; the first journey of Paul to Galatia expressly mentioned in the Acts (16: 6) was undertaken for the purpose of confirming the brethren in the faith (15: 36, 41), which supposes the Galatians to have already received instruction, and this can have been the case only on the previous jour-

## § 100.

The inhabitants of Galatia, or Gallo-Græcia, were a people closely allied to our own nation. Two Gallic tribes, the *Trocmi* and *Tolistoboi*, as their names were distorted or mutilated in the languages of the Greeks and Romans, together with a Celtic race, the *Tectosages* (all precisely alike in language and manners, as we are assured by Strabo, who was their neighbor),<sup>1</sup> more than two centuries and a half before the Christian era conquered that part of Asia which was called from them Galatia and Grecian Gaul.

Jerome makes an important remark respecting their language. He says that it was the same as that spoken in his time by the Treviri.<sup>2</sup> If this was the case, they must have been of German origin; for, long before Jerome's time, the Germans had possession of the countries on the Moselle, and the Treviri were so proud of their German descent that they vaunted it whenever others confounded them with the Gauls.<sup>3</sup>

This father visited Gaul and the country of the Treviri, and soon after set out for Asia, travelling through Phrygia and Galatia, and could thus compare the languages before his recollection had been weakened by time.

The assertion of the father finds confirmation in other facts. Livy calls the leader of the horde, that led the van of the expedition to Asia, *Lutarius*,<sup>4</sup> which is clearly a German name.

At least one of the three tribes must have been of German origin, though Strabo makes them alike in language and customs. One of them, that of the Tectosages, is mentioned elsewhere in history. This people (whom Cæsar calls *Volcæ Tectosages*, perhaps nation (*Volk*) of the Tectosages), had in ancient times, when the Gauls were of a warlike character, left Gaul and settled in the Hercynian forest, the commencement of which was in our vicinity, in *finibus Rauracorum*, where they are said to have gradually adopted German manners and customs.<sup>5</sup>

---

ney through Asia Minor, when Paul and Barnabas preached at Lystra and Derbe, and in the region round about, εἰς τὴν περίχωρον (Acts 14: 6).

But must the Galatians have known by sight and personally all of whom Paul assumes in his Epistle that they knew something; e. g. James, Cephas, and John? Further, the purpose of confirming the brethren did not prohibit labors in behalf of those who had not yet heard the word. They even on this journey thought of visiting Bithynia and other countries of Asia, and would have done so, had they not been forbidden by the Spirit (Acts 16: 6, 7). Luke, moreover, clearly distinguishes the Galatians from those whose faith was to be confirmed. He commences speaking of the latter in 15: 41, *ἀνέρχετο . . . ἐπιστηρίζων*, and concludes at 16: 5, *Αἱ μὲν ἐκκλησίαι ἐστήρεοντο*, and does not begin till afterwards to speak of Phrygia and Galatia.

<sup>1</sup> Strabo, L. XII. p. 390.

<sup>2</sup> Hieronym. Proleg. in Ep. ad Galat. L. II. "Unum est quod inferimus . . . Galatas, excepto sermone Græco, quo omnis oriens loquitur, propriam linguam eandem habere, quam Treviros, nec referre, si aliqua exinde corruperint, cum et Aphri Phœnicum linguam nonnullâ ex parte mutaverint."

<sup>3</sup> Taciti Germania, Sect. 28.

<sup>4</sup> Livius L. XXXVIII. c. 16.

<sup>5</sup> Julius Cæsar, Bell. Gall. L. VI. § 22. Beatus Rhenanus supposes them to have dwelt in Würtemberg, in the county of Teck.

This happened, we are told by another author, at the time when Brennus, with an army of Gauls, conquered Rome; their leader to the Hercynian forest was *Sigovesus*.<sup>1</sup> This name, again, is so evidently German, that we can hardly think they were at their first settlement an entirely foreign nation, and only gradually adopted the peculiarities of our forefathers. In fact, they did not remain long.

Half a century afterward, another Brennus<sup>2</sup> took a multitude of these Tectosages along with him to Thrace, to swell the horde that was about to pass into Asia. This great expedition, it would seem, issued from Gaul, passed over the Rhine, along the Danube, through Noricum, Pannonia, and Mæsia, and at its entrance into Germany carried along with it many of the Tectosages. On their arrival in Thrace, Lutarius took them with him, crossed the Bosphorus, and effected the conquest in Asia Minor of which we have before spoken.

But, supposing myself able to pursue this investigation further, this is not the place for the purpose; particularly as neither the biography of the apostle nor this Epistle would be likely to receive any important illustration from it.

In their new country they became acquainted with the Greek language, and were called *Gallo-Græci*; they made use of this language in public documents and inscriptions, of which there are still some remains.

They retained, it appears, their ancestral religion, though they seem to have learned from the Phrygians the worship of the *magna mater deûm*; and they likewise deviated from the custom of the Gallic and Germanic nations in erecting temples. There were few cities to be found among them, with the exception of Ancyra, Tavium, and Pessinus, which carried on some trade. It was this circumstance, probably, which attracted thither those Jewish citizens, who, according to Josephus' account, enjoyed here considerable immunities, the record of which was deposited in the temple of Augustus at Ancyra.<sup>3</sup>

Although the climate diminished their courage and hardiness,<sup>4</sup> still they were not effeminate, and not long before the Christian era were so far from having lost their former simplicity of manners, that a Roman orator, among his encomiums on their king, remarks particularly that he was a very industrious husbandman and grazier.<sup>5</sup>

When Paul first came among them, he met with the most cordial reception and very general adherence (Acts 16: 6. Gal. 4: 13, 14 seq.). When, however, on a subsequent visit (Acts 18: 23), he evinced less forbearance towards Judaism, and expressed himself with more freedom respecting its value, ἀληθεύων (Gal. 4: 16), those Jews residing in the country, who had embraced Christianity, hardly waited for his departure before they began zealously to uphold the law of Moses.

Certain Jewish Christians, however, who had not long since come thither from Jerusalem, seem to have been particularly active in this

1 [Livius, L. V. c. 34.]

2 Livius, L. XXXVIII. c. 16.

3 Joseph. Antiq. L. XVI. c. 6.

4 Florus, Hist. Rom. L. II. c. 11. Liv. XXXVII. c. 8.

5 Cicero, Pro rege Deiotaro: "Diligentissimus agricola et pecuarius."

matter ; for the leaders in it extolled the heads of the church at Jerusalem, viz. John, Peter, and James, and boasted of being their disciples, drawing disadvantageous comparisons between Paul and them, and Paul's doctrine and their doctrine, as is evident from intimations contained in the Epistle. And, in fact, the Jewish converts gained the ascendancy, and persuaded the Galatians of the indispensableness of the whole Jewish ritual to the followers of the Messiah. The Galatians permitted themselves to be circumcised, and, indeed, they conformed to the Jewish religion in its entire extent. Thus all Paul's aims were at once thwarted, his labors rendered in part abortive, and his hopes grievously disappointed.

### § 101.

He soon learned this, and again urged upon their attention in this Epistle the principles he had recently inculcated upon them. Though not merely a Jew from Jerusalem, but an angel from heaven, should teach any other doctrine than that I have given you, believe him not (—1: 10). I am not a disciple of man, receiving my commission from Peter, James, or John, but an apostle, taught and endued with authority from on high, and am in no wise inferior to either of the other apostles. I have even rebuked Peter to his face, for his insincerity in regard to Judaism (—3: 1). Have you, through Jesus Christ, only become more fully acquainted with the Jewish law, or have you received instruction of a more exalted, spiritual, and efficacious character? Did Abraham obtain the promise of the Messiah by the law, which did not then exist, or through faith? Has not the law rather brought the displeasure of God upon mankind, from which Jesus has ransomed us (—3: 23)?

The law was but a preparation for Christianity; it was only our schoolmaster; but now we are released from its superintendence; we have become of age, and are heirs of God (—4: 8). Further; ye were freemen through Christ, and now have returned of your own accord to a state of bondage. Christianity is the religion of liberty, the law that of bondage, as you may see from an allegorical explanation of the story of Hagar and Sarah (—5:). Judaism, therefore, is no longer suitable for Christians; labor rather to improve your morals, and to amend your minds and hearts. Be on your guard against those who would calumniate me; humble the pride and arrogance of self-conceited wisdom. Henceforth glory in Christ alone.

### § 102.

#### THE FIRST EPISTLE TO THE CORINTHIANS.

Corinth, a large commercial city, between two harbors, one of which afforded an entrance to the western and the other to the eastern mariner, was situated, as it were, in the centre of the civilized world, where merchants from every quarter of the globe met and exchanged their articles of traffic. It was also celebrated for the Isthmian games, and the



temple of Venus, in which more than a thousand priestesses of that goddess ministered to licentiousness under cover of religion.<sup>1</sup> On these various accounts there was a constant influx of foreigners of every description, who brought the wealth and the vices of all nations to a city where the mariner, the merchant, and the soldier, could freely indulge those vices for money.<sup>2</sup>

This city, for having ill-treated certain Roman envoys, became, with all its wealth and treasures of art, the spoil of the Romans, and was razed to the ground by Mummius. After remaining a long time uninhabited, it was rebuilt by Julius Cæsar, and peopled with a Roman colony. It soon flourished anew; three of the Cæsars busied themselves in increasing its splendor, and prosecuting the vast enterprise of cutting through the isthmus and uniting both harbors, in order to avoid the passage round the promontory of Malea.

The ancient manners of the city likewise returned. Acrocorinth was again the residence of the Isthmian Dione; and a profligate life was commonly called a Corinthian life.<sup>3</sup> It was regarded as the most voluptuous of all cities,<sup>4</sup> and the satirist must have been in jest, when apparently doubtful whether, in his time, Athens or Corinth merited the preference in this respect.<sup>5</sup> In this city Paul was desirous of founding a Christian church. He visited it, as we have seen, on his earliest journey to Europe, and preached the kingdom of God first to the Jews. They were, however, no less indocile here than at Thessalonica. He succeeded only in gaining over a few; in particular, two of their chief men, Crispus and Sosthenes. The *metuentes*, however, or Gentiles inclined to Judaism, sincerely attached themselves to him, and seem to have been, in the sequel and always, his faithful adherents; while the Jews, who gradually multiplied, did what they could to frustrate the plans of the apostle. He remained here a year and six months; Timotheus and Silas were his assistants (Acts 18: 1—19).

Circumstances having called him away, many, soon after his departure, relapsed into their old mode of life, again resorted to the priestesses of Acrocorinth, and conducted generally as they were before wont to do. On this account he wrote them an Epistle (1 Cor. 5: 9—12), not now extant however, in which he forbade believers to have any intercourse with such reprobates.

### § 103.

Paul, meanwhile, returned from Jerusalem through Galatia and Phrygia to Ephesus, as he had promised. While he abode there, the

<sup>1</sup> Τὸ τε τῆς Ἀφροδίτης ἱερὸν οὕτω πλοῖσιον ὑπῆρξεν, ὥστε πλείους ἢ χίλιαι ἱεροδούλους ἐκέκτητο ἑταίρας, αἷς ἀντίθεσαν τῇ θεῷ καὶ ἄνδρες καὶ γυναῖκες. Καὶ διὰ ταύτας οὖν ἐπολυχλείτο ἡ πόλις καὶ ἐπλοντίζετο. Strabo, L. VIII. p. 261, or, according to Casaubon's 2d. ed., p. 378.

<sup>2</sup> Strabo, L. XII. p. 385.

<sup>3</sup> Hesych. Lex. κορινθιάζειν, μαστροπεύειν, ἐταιρεῖν.

<sup>4</sup> Dio Chrys. Orat. Corinth. T. II. p. 119. Reisk. Καίτοι πόλιν οἰκεῖτε τῶν οἷσαν τε καὶ γεγεννημένων ἐπαφροδιτοτάτην, and p. 120. Πρώτα καὶ πρῶμα τῆς Ἑλλάδος, ὀλβιοὶ μὲν καὶ ἀφνειοί.

<sup>5</sup> Lucian, Amores.

Corinthians gave him still more urgent occasion for admonition. He wrote them, therefore, two Epistles, which are still extant.

The first of them is the only one of all Paul's Epistles, of the occasion of which we have any account resting on valid authority. In the time of Clement of Rome, the Corinthian church was divided into factions; he therefore recalled to their mind the purport and occasion of the first Epistle of Paul, as a similar case. Then, also, he says, Paul wrote to them because they had formed themselves into parties under the name of this or that apostle, of Cephas or of Apollos.<sup>1</sup>

History gives us no further information. In order to get an idea of the condition of the Corinthian church, we must examine the Epistles themselves, and collect and compare the individual facts they present; for, without this preliminary labor, it will be impossible to understand these letters aright, and comprehend every part of them.<sup>2</sup> These various factions into which they were divided, sought to exalt the leaders they adopted, and whose doctrines they professed to follow, above every one else, *τοὺς ὑπὲρ λίαν ἀποστόλους* (2 Cor. 11: 5. 12: 11), and to depreciate those of their opponents. While some called themselves disciples of Paul, Cephas, or Apollos, others adopted the imposing name of followers of Christ. Probably they proclaimed themselves adherents of James, the brother of our Lord, and thought that thus they became disciples of Jesus in a stricter sense than the rest.

We can perceive that the main dispute was about the obligatory force of Judaism. The supporters of Judaism in Galatia appealed to Cephas and James, in order to oppose against Paul, who discarded the Jewish institutions from the Christian system, authority as fully admitted as his own. This question divided all these various parties, of which we have spoken, into two principal ones. The adherents of Cephas and James were in favour of the law; the friends of Paul adopted his opinion. Apollos, too, with his adherents, was always at heart inclined to favor Paul, and can have had no hand in any rupture (1 Cor. 16: 12).

The leaders of the anti-Pauline party, the *ψευδοᾱπόστολοι*, and *μετασχηματιζόμενοι εἰς ἀποστόλους Χριστοῦ*, as Paul calls them, who pretended to be the assertors and defenders of the doctrines of Cephas and James, were, as might be supposed, converted Jews (2 Cor. 11: 22), who came from abroad, in all probability from Palestine (*ἐρχόμενοι*, 2 Cor. 11: 4), and could, therefore, boast of acquaintance with the apostles at Jerusalem and familiarity with their tenets. They were not even of the better class of Jews, but such as adhered to the doctrines of the Sadducees, and even after becoming Christians, while they were full of zeal for the law, they undermined the hopes of the believers, and raised doubts concerning the resurrection (1 Cor. 15: 35 seq. Comp. Matth. 22: 23); so that Paul was obliged to adduce against them the

<sup>1</sup> *Ἀναλάβετε τὴν ἐπιστολὴν τοῦ μακαρίου Παύλου. Τί πρῶτον ὑμῖν ἐν ἀρχῇ εὐαγγελίου ἔγραψεν; Ἐπ' ἀλήθειας πνευματικῶς ἐπέστειλεν ὑμῖν περὶ αὐτοῦ τε, καὶ Κηρᾶ, καὶ Ἀπολλῶ, διὰ τὸ καὶ τότε προσκλίσαις ὑμᾶς πεποιῆσθαι. Ἀλλ' ἢ πρόσκλιαις ἐκεῖνη, ἥττον ἁμαρτίαν προσένεγκεν· προσκλίσθητε γὰρ ἀποστόλοις, καὶ ἀνδρὶ δεδοκιμασμένῳ παρ' αὐτοῖς.* Clem. I. Ep. ad Cor. c. 47. and Hegesipp. apud Euseb. H. E. L. III. c. 15.

<sup>2</sup> I have here made use of a work which I regard as the best on this subject: Storr, *Notitiæ Hist. Epistolarum Pauli ad Corinth.* Tubing. 1788. 4to.

testimony of James and Cephas, the teachers whose disciples they professed to be (1 Cor. 15: 5, 7).

These Jews, proud of their understanding (1 Cor. 1: 17 seq.), depreciated the authority of Paul, from interested motives, and extolled their own knowledge (1 Cor. 2: 12. 2 Cor. 11: 16, 17).

Vehement as the dispute was, the parties did not have separate places of assembly for instruction and common edification. This very fact, however, was the occasion of many scandalous scenes and disorders.<sup>1</sup>

At their love-feasts, love and kindness were never visible. Instead of eating in common, and refreshing the poor brethren from the food brought with them, every one, as soon as he came, ate what he had, without waiting for another, and frequently some feasted immoderately, while the needy were hungry (1 Cor. 11: 17 seq.).

When some were preparing to pray or sing, others raised their voices for exhortation, and exercised the gifts of the spirit, *λαλεῖν γλώσσαις, προφητεία, ἑρμηνεία*, about the nature of which there has been so much dispute of late (1 Cor. 12: 13: 14:). The women, likewise, did their part, by questions and interruptions, to carry confusion to its height (1 Cor. 14: 34 seq.).

Thus the internal discipline of the assemblies, and all prospect of edification, were at an end; and soon the exterior decency, which had been maintained by the members of the society in civil life, was lost. Formerly, when disputes arose between believers, they were adjusted by umpires from their own number; now, as mutual confidence was more and more diminished, they brought their accusations, to the disgrace of Christianity, before the heathen tribunals (1 Cor. 6: 1 seq.).

As to the main dispute, viz. about the obligation of Jewish observances, it was by no means confined to words and arguments, but each party strove to exhibit its peculiar opinion as clearly as possible in its conduct. Each by its procedure gave all possible occasion for ill-will and complaint on the part of the other. The Jews required circumcision as an indispensable religious rite; the followers of Paul, on the other hand, endeavored to create a new foreskin, and to efface all traces of circumcision (1 Cor. 7: 18 seq.).

While those inclined to Judaism observed and defended a distinction of meats, the adherents of Paul ate every thing, without distinction, which was sold in the shambles, and even the meats which had been offered to idols (1 Cor. 10: 25, 28. 8: 1 seq.).

<sup>1</sup> Many of the disorders reproved by Paul could not have taken place, had they, as has been inferred by some from the expression in 1 Cor. 1: 2, *ἐν παντὶ τόπῳ αὐτῶν τε καὶ ἡμῶν*, possessed separate places of assembling. The interpretation I have given of this passage is disapproved by Bertholdt (Einl. Th. VI. § 719. p. 3331), and justly. But neither am I satisfied with his, for many reasons, which cannot be detailed here. Perhaps the following explanation is less objectionable. The apostle wishes grace and peace from God to the members of the Corinthian church, *ἐν παντὶ τόπῳ*, wherever they might be; *ἐν τόπῳ αὐτῶν*, at Corinth and in its vicinity, and *ἐν τόπῳ ἡμῶν*, i. e. with me. For there were several with Paul, besides those who were about to return (16: 17), viz. Sosthenes (1: 1), Apollos (16: 12), probably those of the house of Chloe (1: 11), and others. The *ἀδελφοί* (16: 20), were not either Asiatics or Ephesians, as the salutations of these occur before (16: 18, 19), but no doubt Corinthians, who had left the scene of these disorders and betaken themselves to Paul.

Nor was this enough; they made no scruple to be present themselves at the sacrificial feasts. Sometimes they even participated in scandalous transactions which occurred at these feasts, and inconsiderately plunged themselves into gross misdemeanors (1 Cor. 10: 20, 21. 8: 10 seq.).

According to Jewish custom, the women were to be veiled in the synagogues and public assemblies. This usage of the synagogues the anti-Jews discarded (2 Cor. 11: 5, 6, 10 seq.), and in this point followed the practice of the Gentiles.

In opposition to Judaism, which considered offspring by matrimony as a special blessing from God, some imposed upon themselves a life of celibacy, which they justified by Paul's example (1 Cor. 7: 7, 8), and recommended to others (1 Cor. 7: 1 seq. 25). Some even went so far as to resolve on perpetual continence in the married state (1 Cor. 7: 3—5).

In what manner the supporters of Judaism went astray in their zeal to give offence to their opponents, we have no information; with the exception of a single case, in which they were unrivalled. They even defended the Jewish casuistical indulgences to proselytes, and (a thing of which the Pauline party is acquitted, 2 Cor. 2: 11) allowed a Gentile, who conformed to Judaism while professing Christianity, to marry his step-mother. For, according to the ancient doctrine, whosoever embraced Judaism was considered as a new-born child, *גר שנתיירר* כקטן שנוולד, and all his previous connexions were looked upon as null. His mother, father, brethren, and sisters, were not now related to him.<sup>1</sup> In such a case his previous connexions by marriage were no longer at all regarded, and improprieties, founded on principle, were the consequence.

### § 104.

Chloe, a believer at Corinth, gave the apostle the first news of these dissensions (1 Cor. 1: 11). Some information he gained from others, *ἀκούεται* (1 Cor. 5: 1). At last the Corinthians themselves sent a deputation, of which it would seem Apollos and Sosthenes were members (1 Cor. 1: 1. 16: 12), with a letter to the apostle. He not only replied to this, but took notice of the preceding accounts which he had received. When he composed his reply, he was still at Ephesus, where he intended to remain till Pentecost (16: 8). It was, therefore, written about the close of his residence in this city, in the beginning of the fourth year of Nero. The Corinthians probably received his letter at the time of the passover, to which reference is had in the finely conceived metaphor in 1 Cor. 5: 7, 8.

But we are not permitted undisputed possession of this passage, which is such a definite designation of time. Is not this, it is said, totally mistaking an allegory of the apostle, which merely contains an injunction to be blameless and manifest devout reverence towards God? It is true, that if there were only the words, "Know ye not that a little leaven

<sup>1</sup> Jo. Selden, *De successionibus ad leges Ebræorum*. c. 26. p. 191. Elzevir. 1638.



leaveneth the whole lump? purge out, therefore, the old leaven," the figure might, as in Gal. 5: 9, contain no specific reference, and be only an allusion to purity in general. But the apostle here contracts the circle of his figure, and mentions the passover: "for Christ our passover is sacrificed for us." How happened Paul, in speaking of excommunication, to select the figure of the passover, unless the excommunication were to take place at that time? If it were to take place at Pentecost, or any other time, the figure would have had no occasion or pertinency. Paul then proceeds: *ὥστε ἐορτάζομεν*, "so that we may keep the feast, not with old leaven," etc. The word *ἐορτάζειν* cannot mean here, *devoutly to serve God*. The subject is not the reformation of believers, or a change to a more virtuous life; but the purification of the church by the expulsion of an unworthy member. Hence the proposed general interpretation, is entirely aside from the purpose of the writer, and we are restricted to the more particular one: that you may keep this feast as a purified church, free from the intrusion of a wicked participant.

Paul intrusted the Epistle, it would seem, to some of the society who were going home (16: 15—19), viz. Stephanus, Fortunatus, and Achaicus; while Apollos and Sosthenes abode still at Ephesus (16: 12. comp. with 1: 1). For it was not only proper, but necessary, to deliver to the deputies the evidence that their mission had been accomplished, to carry to those who had sent them.

At the same time, and as it is easy to see, in company with them, Timothy went to Corinth, as a deputy on the part of the apostle; for so the dignity of ecclesiastical affairs demanded (Acts 15: 27). It was his duty to promote the effect of the Epistle by word of mouth, and, whenever there was any doubt as to its meaning, to explain and solve it, in accordance with the apostle's sentiments. So much of his business is stated in the Epistle itself (4: 16, 17).

The time at which Timothy set out may be inferred from the fact that he was expected back again at Ephesus on the feast of Pentecost (1 Cor. 16: 8—12). According to this injunction, he must have set out as soon as practicable after winter had broken up. If he went the whole distance by sea, he may have embarked about the spring equinox; for mariners commenced their long voyages at the *æquinocmium vernum*.<sup>1</sup> The number of days consumed in going from Ephesus to Athens may be inferred from a journey of Cicero's, which was rather dilatory. He set out from Ephesus on the first of October, and arrived at Athens on the fourteenth.<sup>2</sup> His brother Quintus accomplished the same voyage in precisely the same time.<sup>3</sup> Taking these voyages as a standard, and allowing a day or two for the passage from Athens to Corinth, Timotheus arrived at the latter place sometime during the first week in April.

Let us suppose, however, that he thought it more advisable to take the land route to Troas, and then through Macedonia, in order to abridge his voyage by sea. We know that, with extraordinary expedi-

1 Liv. L. XXXVII. c. 9.

2 Cic. ad Attic. Ep. L. VI. Ep. 8 and 9.

3 Ad. Attic. Ep. L. III. Ep. 9. where "valde fuit ei properandum" of course refers to what follows, "ne quid absens," etc.

tion, the distance from Amphissa to Amphipolis could be passed over in six days.<sup>1</sup> Although Timothy would not want aid and means of expedition among the churches of Macedonia, we will not assume any thing extraordinary; and, in order that we may proceed safely, we will derive our estimate of the European journey from two passages in the (so-called) Itinerary of Antoninus. One passage contains an account of the distance from Athens to Thessalonica.<sup>2</sup> From Athens to Oropus are thirteen Roman miles; from thence to Thebes, forty-four; to Chalcis, thirty-six; to Opus, twenty-four; to Demetrias, forty-eight; to Larissa, fourteen; to Dios, forty-four; to Beræa, twenty-four; to Thessalonica, seventeen. In all, two hundred and sixty-four. The other states the distance from Thessalonica to Neapolis.<sup>3</sup> From Thessalonica to Melisurgis, twenty-seven; from thence to Apollonia, twenty; to Amphipolis, seventeen; to Philippi, thirty; to Neapolis, thirty-three. In all, one hundred and twenty-seven. Both distances together amount to three hundred and ninety-one Roman miles. Reducing them to German miles, taking according to the usual reckoning five Roman to one German mile, we have seventy-eight of our miles, or one hundred and fifty-six hours, i. e. fifteen or sixteen days' journeys. If we add two days for the distance from Athens to Corinth, and four days of rest, we shall have twenty-two days. For the passage across from Troas we will take, according to Acts 20: 6, five days, although on another occasion Paul (Acts 16: 11), seems to have accomplished this journey in two days; for the distance from Troas to Ephesus we will take as much time as Paul required to go to Miletus, viz. four days. Thus the whole amount is thirty-one days. Hence, if he left Ephesus at the beginning of March, he arrived at Corinth sometime in the first week of April. Whichsoever route, then, he chose, he reached the place of his destination before Easter.

### § 105.

The Epistle relates principally to the faults of the adherents of Paul, and would seem to have been intended only for them. They had themselves written to the apostle, and acknowledged his authority. He therefore occupies himself almost entirely with the faults of the anti-Jewish party, nearly neglecting to say any thing of those of the party inclined to Judaism.

The Epistle may be divided into three sections. The first relates to what he had learned by the messages from Chloe; the second to what he had heard from other sources; and the last to what had been written to him by the Corinthians themselves.

With reference to the information he had received from Chloe (1: 11), he exhorts them to unity, and thanks God that he himself had given no occasion for the formation of parties. He avers that though

<sup>1</sup> Liv. L. XXXVII. c. 17. L. XLIV. c. 45.

<sup>2</sup> Vet. Rom. Itiner. sive Antonini Itinerarium etc. Ed. Wesseling. p. 326—328.

<sup>3</sup> P. 320—21. Xerxes fled from Salamis across the Hellespont in less than thirty days (Cor. Nep. in Themist. c. 5), and Agesilaus with an army reached Bœotia across the Hellespont in the same time (Idem, in Agesil. c. 4).

he had indeed preached without the arts of oratory or any parade of learning, he had declared the unadulterated truth of God. Paul and Apollos (and the same is understood of other heads of parties) are alike only servants of God and of the Gospel, each of whom will receive his reward according to his desert; and, if preference is due to any, it rather belongs to the first messengers of the faith than to subsequent teachers.

With reference to what he had learned from other sources (5: 1), he enjoins upon them not to tolerate abominable incest, but to deliver over the transgressor to Satan (—5: 9). They are to shun those in the church who are licentious and immoral, never to bring their controversies before heathen tribunals (—6: 11), and to walk worthy of the interest which they have in Christ (—7: 1).

He then replies to the letter (7: 1). He cannot approve of the continence of married persons; nor of one party's separating from the other on the pretext of unbelief. Single persons, who cannot contain themselves, should marry (—7: 18). Those who have been circumcised should use no art to create a foreskin anew; and, in general, each one should be content with his condition (—7: 25).

To single persons his advice is that they should remain single; not because it is sinful to marry; on the contrary, it is even well to do so; but times will come when it may be desirable for one to live independent, that he may not be drawn away by his connexions into infidelity to religion (—8:).

It is true that an idol is nothing, and that there is no difference between meats offered in sacrifice and other meats; but, if a weak brother be offended, his weakness should be respected; and none should by any means be present at the feasts in the temples (—9: 1).

Here the apostle digresses, and asserts the purity of his purposes and his doctrine, appealing to his disinterestedness, which entirely acquitted him of views of private advantage. His reward and consideration were God and Christ (—9: 27).

He then makes a transition again to idolatry, draws attention to the example of the fathers, and to the incompatibility of idolatry with Christianity (—10: 23), and recommends anew a scrupulous regard to the conscience of a weak brother (—11:).

He tells them that, for the sake of propriety in religious worship, the women should be covered in their assemblies, and be silent (—11: 17).

The Lord's supper is a memorial of our Lord's death; every one should therefore partake of it with a conscience void of offence (11: 17—12:).

Each one should use the gifts of the Spirit for the edification of all; for they were not given for individuals, but for the advantage of all. All form but one body, of which each is a member, and every member should conduce to the benefit of the whole body. These gifts, however, are to be esteemed as nothing in comparison with the law of love and peace (—14:).

In regard to the resurrection, he says he has informed them distinctly that Jesus rose from the dead, that he appeared to James and Cephas, and to more than five hundred brethren at once, and lastly to him also; and declares that Jesus will raise all to glory or shame, according to

their deserts (—16:). Finally, he enjoins it upon them to make a charitable collection among themselves for their indigent brethren in Palestine.

### § 106.

#### THE SECOND EPISTLE TO THE CORINTHIANS.

Paul abode some time longer at Ephesus, but sent Timotheus and Erastus through Macedonia to Corinth (Acts 19: 22. 1 Cor. 16: 10). Thither, likewise, he sent Titus, who was commissioned to observe the impression and effect produced by the apostle's letter, and to give him information which might direct his future measures (2 Cor. 2: 13. 7: 6—16), and likewise to superintend the collection for the poor (8: 6). When Paul departed from Ephesus to go through Macedonia and Achaia, he expected to find Titus at Troas, returning from his commission (2 Cor. 2: 13). He did not meet with him, however, till he reached Macedonia (7: 5), where he obtained from him joyful news as to the success of his Epistle and of the measures he had taken (7: 7, 8, 9).

It was, however, in general, only those of Paul's party, who appeared repentant, submissive, and ready to amend; the Judaizing party, on the contrary, only sought to discover in his Epistle materials for a new attack upon his character.

The apostle had several times, particularly in this Epistle, promised to visit them (1 Cor. 4: 19, 20, 21. 16: 4 seq.), and had not yet fulfilled his promise. They therefore charged him with fickleness and an unstable disposition, and took occasion thence to cast suspicion upon his doctrines (2 Cor. 1: 15—2:), and to accuse him of obscurity and indefiniteness in his teaching (—4: 7).

Moreover, as the letter was replete with earnestness, severity, and energy, they instituted a comparison of it with his procedure in other circumstances, and observed that it was true he had courage to make use of such language, when he was at a distance, and was not looking people in the face, but in other circumstances he was much more complaisant, and was content to use a more indulgent tone (2 Cor. 10: 9, 10).

Paul, in order to show the disinterested rectitude of his preaching and doctrines, had reminded the Corinthians, that he had in no instance sought his own advantage, had even refused the wages which were his due, and had endured the toils of instruction and encountered danger and persecution only from a sense of duty and for the cause of Jesus (1 Cor. 9: 9 seq.). This was in truth an overwhelming argument, and his adversaries could not suffer its validity to continue unimpaired. In order to invalidate it, it would seem, they, likewise, wholly renounced wages or remuneration, that they might in this respect be on equal terms with the messenger of truth (2 Cor. 11: 12, 13, 14). Moreover, the collections for the poor afforded them a pretext for attacking his disinterestedness; particularly the collection which had been requested in his Epistle, which was now going forward under the direction of



Titus. They declared that this was the way in which he always plundered one church, in order for a time to appear disinterested in another (2 Cor. 11: 7 seq. 12: 15—17).

### § 107.

All this Paul learned from Titus, whom he met in Macedonia (2 Cor. 7: 5). In order to prevent the occurrence of any unpleasant scenes on his arrival at Corinth, to the prejudice of his success and authority, he resolved to refute these slanders, to confirm the declarations he had already made, and to prepare their minds more thoroughly for his coming. He therefore sent them a second Epistle, which, as Timothy was with him (2 Cor. 1: 1), was probably written in Macedonia, in the fourth year of Nero's reign.

He first mentions his sufferings, and particularly his late perils in Asia (—1: 12). He then speaks of his repeated purpose of coming to them through Macedonia, which purpose remained always unaltered, although he had been obliged to delay its execution out of tenderness to them, and partly, also, that he might not come sorrowing, but with joy. He forgives the individual who had most grieved him, and wishes him to be again received in love (—2: 12). He then touches upon the state of his mind at Troas, and speaks of the consolations afforded him by God on account of the sincerity of his intentions (—3:). He needs no letters of recommendation to them; their sentiments and the ministry to which God had called him are his recommendation; not a Mosaic ministry, but one which was spiritual and far more exalted; on which account he preaches with plainness, and none find his doctrine obscure but those who shut their eyes against the light (—4: 7). He is indeed a man, as he deeply feels from the troubles which encompass him, which, however, he can endure, being supported by the hopes of a future life (—5: 11). His conscience acquits him; he had conducted towards them in love; and, as Christ by his death had reconciled the world to God, he had always kept in mind that he was an ambassador for the purpose of reconciliation, and in all things he had approved himself a servant of God. (—6: 11). Here he inserts a warning against idolatry (—7: 2).

He then makes a transition to Titus, and the consolation which he had brought him. He now laments that he had caused them sorrow; still, the result has been a joyful one (—7: 16). The Macedonians had outstripped them in the work of benevolence; he hopes they will not remain behind-hand; wherefore he sends Titus to them with two very estimable companions. He doubts not their readiness to relieve the necessities of their poorer brethren (—10:).

In the tenth chapter, he recurs to his own justification, and defends himself against the charges of his enemies; viz. that Paul, when present, was indulgent, and had courage to be severe only when he was at a distance; that, though he took no stated recompense, he yet collected money in the churches. He then draws a parallel between himself, in his apostolic office, and these false teachers, which he pursues with much spirit as far 12: 19. He even fears, he continues, (i. e. from this

quarter) scandalous conduct, which, however unwillingly, he must treat with severity. He concludes with the customary salutations.

Such are the mere skeletons of these two masterly compositions. If, bringing before our minds the situation in which they were composed, we attentively examine their contents, we are compelled to admire both the wisdom of their general plan and the management of particular points. We can do no otherwise than honour such prudence, love such good-will, and observe with pleasure every manifestation of his feelings, the dignity in reproof, the propriety in entreaty, the just proportion of praise and encouragement, the changes in his emotions, the transition from severity to sympathy and from rebuke to commiseration, from an affectionate manner to an energetic and terrible tone, and, in particular, the knowledge of human nature and the prudence in managing difficult matters, which are displayed in their contents.

### § 108.

In order to justify the opinion as to the character of these Epistles which I have formed from the examination I have made, I must not leave them without defending the second from some unmerited charges. It has been pretended that it wants methodical arrangement, a regular course of thought, and proper connexion. Hence some, as is generally the case, have taken a step further, and attempted to get rid of particular parts of the Epistle, as not consistent with the idea they had adopted in regard to the extent of its plan, and as having been added subsequently.<sup>1</sup> The introduction is occupied with the apostle's personal fortunes, purposes, feelings, and wishes, as far as the third chapter. The remainder divides itself into three parts, together with a conclusion.

In the first part, he declares himself to be a minister of the New Testament, in which character he exercises a *διακονία* of a spiritual nature, far more exalted than the Mosaic; not with craft and wily obscurity, but for the purpose of enlightening men, according to the light which is revealed by Jesus Christ (—4: 7). Yet he bears about this treasure in an earthen vessel; he is a man, pursuing this his calling under every species of human suffering, only enjoying the *πίστις* that, when he shall have left this earthy tabernacle, a reward awaits him in a better mansion (—5: 11). From reverence for God, and in accordance with the example of Jesus Christ, who died for all to reconcile them to God, he has taken upon himself a *διακονία καταλλαγῆς*, a ministry of reconciliation (—6:), a *διακονία* without reproach, which he prosecutes with constancy under all afflictions, as the *διάκονος* of God (—6: 11). All that he here says of the dignity of his calling, with reference to his Judaizing opponents and their reproaches, of his ministry of reconciliation and justification, its troubles and rewards, constitutes one section, in which the thought, though interrupted by parentheses according to Paul's custom, always recurs to his *διακονία*. The first important digression is 6: 11—7: 2, the warning against idolatry.

After this, he makes a transition to Titus, the consolation which he

<sup>1</sup> All the literature of this subject will be found completely presented, as usual, in Bertholdt's "Einleit. in die Schriften des N. T." Th. 6. § 727. Some academic writings which he cites, I have unfortunately never seen.

brought him, the effects of his Epistle, which he describes; then speaks of the collection; of the good example set by the Macedonians; then of a second commission as to this matter undertaken by Titus, and subjoins an exhortation, which he acknowledges is indeed superfluous (—9: 15). This section begins with a mention of Titus, is connected with what is said in relation to him, recurs to him again at last, and forms a second coherent whole, the occasion of which was the collection enjoined in the 1st Ep. 16: 1—6. It was not written any later than what precedes, viz. a short time after the apostle's meeting with Titus (7: 6—13).

But least of all could we dispense with the third part, the refutation of the accusations of his enemies, which he commences with the tenth chapter. The adherents of Paul and Apollos had yielded to reason, but those who called themselves by the name of Christ, *πειριθότες ἑαυτοὺς τοῦ Χριστοῦ εἶναι* (10: 7), had vented reproaches in regard to the severity of the Epistle, the collections of money, and the unfulfilled promises. They were to be disarmed, humbled, and deprived of power to do injury, before Paul could appear at Corinth. This part, the most essential to the preservation of his dignity, proceeds in so natural a manner throughout, that nothing can be objected against its unity. All in the section is apposite to his purpose, and a part of it (as e. g. 11: 13—12: 1) is masterly, *in quibus maxime*, to use Cicero's expression, *exultat oratio*.

What can be said in depreciation of this plan? The first part is the general justification of Paul, drawn from the nature of his office, the manner in which he exercised it, and his constant struggle with every species of suffering, for which no temporal advantage could indemnify him. The second part relates to the news brought by Titus, and the collection for the poor which was under his management. The third part consists of a special justification of himself in regard to particular charges, and the complete humiliation of his remaining enemies. What is there in all this that is superfluous, and what that is deficient? How can want of order and connexion be alleged, when there is but a single important digression, and that occurs between the first and the second parts?

Is it meant that there ought to have been no breaks, though the subjects to be treated were various and consequently the discussion was naturally divided into several heads? Is it not evidence of judgment, that the second part is inserted between the general and special justification of himself, lest, if the same subject were pursued to great length, it should become tedious? And ought not the part which was most eloquent, and most important to his purpose, to be at the close, in order to consummate the general impression? Had the second part been appended to this, it would have been even tame and inoperative, after such a lofty effort.

Still it is objected, that the tone of the first part is very different from that of the third; the former is mild, affectionate, and cordial, while the latter is severe, vehement, and reckless. But who would divide the oration of Demosthenes *Pro coroná* into two pieces, because in his general defence, calmness and circumspection predominate, while, on the other hand, in abashing and scourging his accuser, in the parallel

between himself and Æschines, words of bitter and taunting import fall like a thunder-shower, in impetuous effusions? There is no species of discourse which does not admit of a rise; and is it possible that in such discourse as this, the language should flow on as softly and smoothly as in the quiet statement of an argument? What philologist would require that Paul should no-where rise in the style of his discourse, under penalty of having that part of it abstracted from the rest?

All that can be said with any colour of reason is, that in the first few chapters the points treated of are not always kept distinct, the cause of which has been properly looked for in the apostle's deep emotion.<sup>1</sup>

### § 109.

#### THE FIRST EPISTLE TO TIMOTHY.

Paul went from Ephesus to Macedonia, leaving Timothy behind him (1 Tim. 1: 3); and soon after wrote this Epistle. The apostle was at Ephesus twice; on which occasion did this occur?

After his first visit to this city (Acts 18: 19—23), he went to Jerusalem, and the departure to Macedonia mentioned in this Epistle cannot have taken place then.

The other visit to Ephesus is related in Acts 19: 1—41. After a long residence here, he was obliged to leave the city on account of an uproar, and then *departed to go into Macedonia* (Acts 20: 1 seq.). The Epistle was written on this occasion, between the first and the second to the Corinthians.

To suppose, for the purpose of this Epistle, a later visit of the apostle to Ephesus, in addition to the two mentioned in the Acts, one undertaken, perhaps, after his imprisonment at Rome, is forbidden by the circumstances. Among other things lying at the foundation of this Epistle, is the fact, that the teachers and elders of the church, who should conduct its affairs, had not yet been appointed. Now, a few months after, when Paul returned to Asia from his Macedonian journey, this had been done; as he sent for the elders from Ephesus to Miletus, that he might see them in their new calling, and represent and enforce the duties of the office they had assumed (Acts 20: 17—28 seq.). The Epistle must, therefore, have preceded this occurrence.

Well-founded and entirely correct as all this is, there is still an apparent difficulty in the way. Before Paul went from Ephesus to Macedonia, he sent thither Timothy and Erastus (Acts 19: 22); now how could Timothy have remained behind at Ephesus?

He sent Titus to Corinth, also; and yet, though he was commissioned to remark the conduct of the church and the effect of his Epistle, and to make arrangements in regard to the collection (§ 106), he expected to meet him again at Troas (2 Cor. 2: 12). Much more easily could Timothy, who had no commission to detain him (§ 104), have reached Paul before his departure, as directed (1 Cor. 16: 11).

<sup>1</sup> Eichhorn, Einl. in das N. T. III Id Bd. 1st Hälfte, § 225.



But the difficulty, it may be said, lies in the fact, that though the apostle had determined to remain at Ephesus till Pentecost (1 Cor. 16: 8), he was unexpectedly compelled by an uproar to leave the city sooner (Acts 19: 23 seq.). Supposing that he was expelled before Pentecost, it can be proved that Timothy might have arrived before that time. If he preferred a voyage, as the favorable season of the year would lead us to suppose, he was only sixteen days in returning (§ 104). Now supposing him to have set out on the third day after the passover, from which day the fifty days to Pentecost were reckoned, he arrived at Ephesus thirty-four days before Pentecost. If he decided to go round by way of Macedonia and Troas, he arrived at Ephesus in thirty-one days, nineteen before Pentecost. In either case he must have arrived a considerable time before the feast. Now who can prove that he notwithstanding arrived too late? On the contrary, we see that Paul did not meet with him at Troas, or in Macedonia. It was only Titus whom he encountered on his route; and concerning this meeting he repeatedly expresses his joy in the second Epistle to the Corinthians, without making even the most distant allusion to such a happy meeting with Timothy. Nor was the apostle expelled from Ephesus so much earlier than it was his intention to leave the city, that Timothy could not have found him there when he arrived. There was so little difference in point of time, that, notwithstanding this occurrence, he counted upon finding Titus at Troas, the place which he had appointed (2 Cor. 2: 12). If, now, the difference of time was not so great as to force him to renounce the idea of meeting Titus at the place appointed, it must have been trifling; it cannot by any means have amounted to nineteen days, which time must have remained before Pentecost, after Timothy's arrival at Ephesus, even if he took the most circuitous way thither.

Paul, therefore, might have left him in this city, when he was compelled to save himself by flight, and have given him the commissions which the Epistle contains. As soon as they were executed, however, Timothy sought the apostle, with whom we find him soon after, when the second Epistle to the Corinthians was written (2 Cor. 1: 1).

The Epistle to Titus, as we have said, was written on Paul's first arrival at Ephesus; and this, which bears so much resemblance to it, was written after his expulsion from Ephesus, three years and some weeks later than the former.

### § 110.

But, it is objected, can Timothy so soon have left the place assigned him? Would he venture to do so without being called away? For, supposing that every thing else which the Epistle required had been accomplished, he was appointed further to watch the false teachers. True; but let us be careful not to give the expression *παραγγέλλης* (1 Tim. 1: 3), "that thou mightest charge some that they teach no other doctrine" etc., a more extensive sense than belongs to it. Besides, he is directed not to engage in any discussions with them (4: 7).

Be this as it may, when the question is asked, Could Timothy have left his station so soon? we may ask in return, Could he remain any longer with safety? Paul's life was in danger when he left Ephesus

(2 Cor. 1: 8, 9), and Timothy was his accomplice in every thing charged against him (Acts 19: 24—41:). Now, if the apostle's enemies had discovered that he was in the city, as they must have done soon, was it possible for him to remain any longer? And if this was not advisable, what else should we expect him to do, but to make all the arrangements that time permitted, and then hasten to the apostle, with whom we soon find him.

But, supposing him to have finished his business at Ephesus, can he have had time to reach Paul in Macedonia? Paul had determined, as we must repeat once more, to remain at Ephesus till Pentecost (1 Cor. 16: 21); but was driven from the city before that time, and departed by way of Macedonia to Greece (Acts 20: 1, 2). Here he resided for some time. He departed thence on the arrival of spring; and it was Easter before he reached Asia again (Acts 20: 6). The whole period of his absence from Asia, therefore, was from Pentecost to Easter, i. e. one year lacking fifty days, or, in other words, something more than ten months. Three months of this time he abode in Greece (Acts 20: 3), viz. the winter months; for when the season began to be favorable he set out on his return, and at Easter had arrived again at Philippi (Acts 20: 6). Thus Paul's journey from Ephesus to Greece, where he passed the winter (*μῆνας τρεῖς*, which were probably November, December, and January), consumed all the time from Pentecost to November, i. e. four whole months; leaving out of the account the time by which his departure from Ephesus preceded Pentecost, the period at which he intended to leave the city.

Hence, if Timothy staid two months at Ephesus, he would have, leaving out of account the supernumerary days, two months still remaining, to overtake the apostle in Macedonia. If, however, on account of impending danger, he did not think himself safe in Ephesus so long, his journey to Macedonia gains all that is to be subtracted from his stay in Ephesus. The whole matter is so plain, that we cannot comprehend the calculation which has recently been made the basis of a contrary opinion.<sup>1</sup>

The Epistle to Timothy must have been one of the first cares of the apostle; for otherwise it was to be feared that the directions according to which Timothy was to proceed would not reach him till after his business was finished. It was written, therefore, about the time of Pentecost, in the fourth year of Nero, or the fifty-ninth of the Christian era.

### § 111.

Ephesus, where Timothy was to act as the apostle's deputy, was the capital of the province of Asia, and, from its happy position, the largest and most important commercial place within the Taurus; and, at the time when Christianity took its rise, it was daily becoming more and more celebrated.<sup>2</sup> All the splendor of its other structures was cast into the shade by the temple of Diana, reckoned by the ancients among the

<sup>1</sup> Eichhorn, Einl. in das N. T. III d Bd. 1st Hälfte, § 248, p. 342, 343.

<sup>2</sup> Strabo L. XIV. Ed. Ima Casaub. p. 441. and 2da Casaub. p. 642. Seneca, Epist. CII. "Ephesum aut Alexandriam, aut si quod est etiamnum frequentius incolis, latius tectis solum."

wonders of the world. Wealth, not to mention other causes, occasioned luxury and effeminacy. In the days of Nero this city is described as not only voluptuous but arrogant; so that the overbearing manners of its inhabitants did not correspond with their refinement in other respects.<sup>1</sup> A propensity to nice and studied attire, and a love for trinkets and finery, are represented as traits of character not exclusively confined to the female sex.<sup>2</sup>

The Jewish Christians, who inhabited the city, did not exhibit much good-will towards Paul, during his residence in it; and the other believers adhered a long time to magical doctrines and arts (Acts 19: 8, 18, 19). Besides these faults, it appears from other sources that the people of these regions were far from being so strict in regard to the duties of the marriage state, even after adopting Christianity, as Christianity required (Eph. 5: 22—33. Coloss. 3: 18—21). In particular, however, as the apostle's preaching inculcated such benevolent principles, and proclaimed with such distinctness the equality of all men in the sight of God and Christ, pretensions were set up by an indolent class of men, which it was necessary to restrain. For the slaves were too prone to extend these principles of equality and brotherhood in the sight of God, to the service of their masters and the common affairs of life, and maintained in their hearts a moral *bellum servile* (Eph. 6: 5—10. Coloss. 3: 22—4: 2).

Such was pretty nearly the state of things at Ephesus, when Paul was unexpectedly compelled to leave the city in haste. It is natural to suppose, therefore, that the arrangements which were necessary in case of his departure had not yet been made. He had hitherto directed the whole course of affairs himself, without having yet, to judge from his letter, appointed persons to perform thenceforward the functions of the ministry and administer the concerns of the church. Still he does not commit their appointment to Timothy, but merely gives him superintendence of their election, and communicates directions to guide them in discharging their duties.

## § 112.

With reference to this state of things, which we have thus imperfectly described, we find in the Epistle an excellent arrangement and an orderly succession in regard to the subjects discussed. The introduction is as follows: Warn against heretical fables; and, likewise, in regard to the law, which rightly understood is indeed good, but, according to our doctrine, was made only for the wicked, of the number of whom I also was, until I was saved by Christianity, as all sinners must be.—And now the first of his religious directions is prayer; in regard to which on behalf of heathen magistrates, scruples existed among those lately converted from Judaism (2: 1—9). He then states, after a short rebuke of female vanity, the part which women should act in the affairs of the church (2: 9—15), and enumerates the qualifications which were to be possessed by persons who should obtain the office of the

<sup>1</sup> Philostrate, in Vit. Apoll. Tyan. L. VIII. c. 3. L. IV. c. 1.

<sup>2</sup> Athenæus, Deipnos. L. XII. c. 29. Schweigh.

ministry or any ecclesiastical superintendence, by elders, deacons, and deaconesses (—3: 14). He then passes, after a concise statement of the orthodox doctrine in regard to the person of Christ (3: 14—4: 1), to false tenets, and points out the doctrines which he is to inculcate in opposition to them (—4: 12). Herewith he connects counsels relating to Timothy himself (—5:), describes the deportment due to those who should be appointed elders, the proper conduct towards widows, and the measures which should be pursued in regard to them (—5: 17). He then speaks of the wages of the elders, of the method of procedure when complaints should be brought against them, and of circumspection in ordaining them (—5: 22). Then, after a digression extending to 6: 1, he admonishes the slaves; and, finally, subjoins exhortations to Timothy himself, and particular warnings and advice for believers generally.

### § 113.

This Epistle has recently met with a distinguished opponent, who flatly denies that it was written by the apostle, and attributes it to some unknown author.<sup>1</sup> Several of his arguments, as e. g. that Timothy, a short time after he is said to have received this pretended letter of the apostle containing commissions of so difficult a character, is found again at Paul's side, and another, which this learned man thinks he finds in the evident want of order and connexion (p. 152 seq.), we have already obviated; there are several others, however, which we will now take into consideration.

The language, says this opponent of the Epistle, is not Paul's. To prove this, he collects (from the beginning to p. 76) expressions which do not occur in either of the other Epistles of Paul, or at least not in the same sense. But it is so, more or less, in regard to other Epistles, likewise; nor do I know how it can be required of Paul that he should not in any one of his Epistles use words which he has not already used in some other, or should exhaust his whole stock of expressions in every one of them. Still, some of the expressions are at least New-Testament expressions; as e. g. *νομοδιδάσκαλος*, *πρεσβυτέριον*, *ἄσπιλος*, *περίεργος*, *ἀπωθείσθαι τὴν πίστιν*, *τὸν λόγον*, etc. Others, which are characterized by a bold composition or self-derivation, and in which the opponent of this Epistle perceives a desire for novelty, as e. g. *ἐτεροδιδασκαλεῖν*, *ἀγαθοεργεῖν*, *εὐμετάδοτος*, *διλόγος*, *διώκτης*, etc., clearly evince, in this very characteristic, their Pauline origin; for Paul was in the habit of forming peculiar words and emphatic expressions, to the total neglect of grammatical laws, in such a manner as the tragedians themselves would hardly have ventured to do; e. g. *καλοδιδάσκαλος*, *ἀγιλάγαθος*, *ὀρθοποδεῖν*, *αὐτοκατάκριτος*, *ὀλοθρευτής*.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Ueber den sogenannten ersten Brief des Paulus an den Timotheus. Ein kritisches Sendschreiben an J. C. Gass," by F. Schleiermacher, Prof. at Halle etc. Berlin, 1807. 8vo.

<sup>2</sup> At the time when I was preparing the first edition of this Introduction, the learned son of the celebrated Henry Planck was engaged in writing a refutation of Schleiermacher's letter: "Bemerkungen über den ersten Paulinischen Brief an den Timotheus, in Beziehung auf das krit. Sendschreiben von H. Pr. Fr. Schleiermacher." Göttingen, 1808. A subject which I could treat only in a general manner, is in this work carefully analyzed and developed with exe-



If, in addition to this peculiarity, we examine the diction generally, we shall find that it is Pauline. The accumulation of words of kindred signification, or false synonymes, the enumerations, the sudden and brief digressions, the parentheses, particularly the large one from 1: 5—18, and the ardor which prevails throughout—all this, taken together, is not like a mere imitation as to the use of certain words, which might be successfully attempted by any one, but is an exact exhibition of Paul's peculiar mode of communication.

To compare, as has been done, the first Epistle to Timothy with the second and with the Epistle to Titus, because their topics are sometimes the same, and then, from the fact that the same thought or expression has in one of them a different turn from that which it has in another, to infer that it was a plagiarism committed by some one who did not understand Paul thoroughly (see p. 78 seq.), is somewhat hasty. It is Paul's custom, when he repeats thoughts and figures in different Epistles, to give them, as far as possible, a different turn, that they may at least have some degree of novelty, and may not be bare repetitions. Not to discuss particular passages, let any one take the Epistles to the Ephesians and Colossians, and observe his procedure in discussing the same subjects, and how strongly my remark is confirmed by the fact, both as to the thought and language. By the paralogism referred to, it would not be at all difficult, in like manner, assuming either of these two Epistles to be genuine, to destroy the credit of the other, and prove it to be a counterfeit, the author of which frequently did not comprehend Paul, and has been unsuccessful, and even obscure, in imitating his phraseology.

The grave objections which are urged against the Epistle (p. 104—113), founded on the circumstance that he mentions Hymenæus and Alexander so cursorily (1: 20), are no objections at all. He mentions them, in passing, as well-known examples of unfortunate self-conceit, and for no other purpose. Similar instances occur in another Epistle, written about the same time, viz. 2 Tim. 1: 15, and 2: 17, where, likewise, he refers to notorious examples (*οἷδας τοῦτο*) of error, as a warning to others, and, as in the other case, in a slight, cursory way: *ὧν ἔστι Φίγελλος καὶ Ἑρμογένης*, and *ὧν ἔστιν Ὑμέναιος καὶ Φίλητος*.

But here a new difficulty occurs. In the first Epistle to Timothy, Hymenæus and Alexander are united; in the second, however, Hymenæus and Philetus occur together, and Alexander is not mentioned till afterwards, and then not as a heretic (2 Tim. 4: 14); a proof that the author of the first Epistle confounded different persons through ignorance.—The Alexander mentioned in 2 Tim. 4: 14 was not indeed a heretic; Paul designates him by the epithet, *ὁ χαλκεύς*, the smith, or worker in metal; and he appears to have been the Alexander mentioned in Acts 19: 33, who now appears here as one of Paul's accusers before the Roman tribunal. But can there not have been another Alexander, a heretic? or, indeed, since this name was so common, many hundred Alexanders? It may, however, be asked, Why in the first Epistle is he mentioned with Hymenæus, as his companion in error, while in the second he is not, and Philetus occupies his place?

getical accuracy, passage by passage, in reference to each expression and its signification, as bearing marks of Pauline origin.

But I ask in return, Was it absolutely and unalterably requisite, that they should invariably be mentioned together? Or was this Alexander immortal, so that he must always be reckoned among the living examples of perversity? Or was he so incorrigible, that he could never cease to be what he was once? Or cannot Hymenæus have so extended and altered his system, that Alexander might come to differ from him in opinion, and no longer be associated with him? Where there are so many possibilities, all equally probable, am I authorized to assume any one at pleasure as fact, and deduce inferences from it? Let us, however, examine Paul once more. In the first Epistle to Timothy, he speaks of heretics whom he had excommunicated, without entering particularly into their tenets, and names Hymenæus and Alexander (1: 20); but in the second, while inculcating the doctrine of our Lord's resurrection, and our own resurrection in connexion with it (2: 8—16), his subject leads him to a particular sect of heretics, who maintained that the resurrection of mankind had already taken place, and he names the authors of this tenet, viz. Hymenæus and Philetus (2: 17). The two cases, therefore, are different; Alexander might be included in the first, without being also liable to the charges in the second.

Lastly, it is objected (p. 124 seq.), that heretics, on whose account, according to the first Epistle, he had left Timotheus behind him at Ephesus, are spoken of by Paul in Acts 20: 29—31, some months after the composition of the Epistle, as though they were not yet in existence; he speaks in the future tense, as though they were to arise hereafter. But this is the view, also, which is exhibited in the first Epistle to Timothy; Paul is apprehensive in regard to the future, ἐν ὑστέροις καιροῖς, in which heretics would make their appearance, according to the express declarations of the Spirit (4: 1 seq.). Those whose purposes were already well-known, such as Hymenæus and Alexander, were expelled from the church (1: 20). There were others, however, who concealed their inclination to peculiar opinions, and were not bold enough to avow them openly, or to inculcate them at all, ἐτεροδιδασκεῖν, though their disposition to accord with other teachers (for that is the meaning of ἐτεροδιδασκαλεῖν, i. e. ἐτέροις διδασκάλοις προσέχειν, *alienos magistros sectari*) did not escape the penetration of the apostle. He uses, directly afterward, the perfectly definite expression, προσέχειν—μύθοις. The word προσέχειν does not signify to teach, but to give assent, to approve, προσέχειν τὸν νοῦν, τὴν γνώμην. On this account, Timothy received no severer injunctions in regard to them, than to admonish them, παραγγέλλειν, and, if such foolish questions were started (4: 7), to reject all discussion of them, παραιεῖσθαι. Moreover, the apostle himself takes no steps against them, but contents himself, in the principal passage relating to them, with calling to mind for their benefit the examples of Hymenæus and Alexander. There were not, therefore, at present, any avowed false teachers in the church, but the danger was, that such would spring up on the first opportunity, unless they were under restraint from higher authority.

## § 114.

## THE EPISTLE TO THE ROMANS.

Who first preached Christianity in Rome, is not known ; but it is certain that Andronicus and Junius were among the earliest missionaries or promoters of the faith (Rom. 16: 7). There was Rufus, too, probably the same whose father assisted in bearing Christ's cross (Rom. 16: 13. Mark 15: 21), and Herodion, and others, formerly Jews, who labored to extend the faith. For here, also, Christianity was introduced through the synagogues, and made so rapid progress, that when Paul wrote to the Romans, their faith was celebrated throughout the whole Christian world (Rom. 1: 8).

The Jews in Rome were very numerous ; they had a large portion of the city on the other side of the Tiber to themselves. The greater part of them were freedmen, who were carried prisoners to Rome under Pompey, and manumitted by their masters, because, from their Jewish customs and institutions, in which they steadfastly persisted, they were rather troublesome than profitable property to Roman masters. They built synagogues in the part of the city allotted to them,<sup>1</sup> observed their sabbaths and religious meetings, and continued still so much attached to their temple and native land, that they annually sent thither valuable gifts and offerings.<sup>2</sup>

Curiosity and other reasons frequently led the Roman ladies to attend the celebration of the sabbath, and to visit the synagogues. Ovid even refers the young gentlemen of his time thither, to the

Cultaque Judæo septima sacra Syro,

to see the beauties of the city collected together.

Many of them learned in this way to know and prize the religious ideas of the Jews, and became *σεβόμεναι* and *metuentes* ; one of whom, named Fulvia, is mentioned by Josephus.<sup>3</sup> By degrees this inclination to Judaism was communicated to the men also, whose *un-Roman* opinions are wittily stated by the poet :

Quidam sortiti metuentem sabbata patrem,  
Nil præter nubes, et cæli numen adorant :  
Nec distare putant humanâ carne suillam,  
Quâ pater abstinuit; mox et præputia ponunt.  
Romanas autem soliti contemnere leges,  
Judaicum ediscunt et servant ac metuunt jus,  
Tradidit arcæno quodcunque volumine Moses.<sup>4</sup>

1 Philo, Legat. ad Caium. p. 697. Ed. Turneb.

2 Cicero, Pro Flacco. c. 28.

3 Antiq. L. XVIII. c. 3. n. 5.

4 Juvenal, Sat. XIV. v. 96 seq. Those, *qui cæli numen adorant*, seem to be the same as those who are called in the Codex Theodosianus, *calicolas*, and who are mentioned likewise in Justinian, Leg. 7, Cod. de Judaicis et Cælicolis, i. e. Judaizing heathen.

Now, when Christianity, likewise, was preached in the sabbath-assemblies, its doctrines were heard by heathen, and many of them acceded to the new system, which, as a universal religion, discarded those vexatious singularities that Judaism enjoined, and inculcated a rational and spiritual worship of the feelings and actions, which could not but commend itself to enlightened men. Thus originated a church in Rome, composed of Jewish and heathen converts to Christianity.

### § 115.

The Jews, at this period, were pretty generally expecting the Christ or Messiah; but the ideas which they had of him restricted his mission and sphere of operation so exclusively to their own nation, that they thought it impossible for any one to share in the benefits he was to confer, unless he belonged to their number, at least as a proselyte. They expected him as a hero or king, who would elevate them to the rank of an independent nation, would render them formidable to the whole world by their victories, and deprive the Romans of their *imperium orbis terrarum*. It was these expectations, in part, which incited in the east the resolution no longer to submit to oppression, to attempt resistance, and to commence that desperate war, which, eleven years after Paul wrote his Epistle to the Romans, put an end to their national existence and constitution.<sup>1</sup>

These ideas concerning the Messiah were not very favorable to the heathen generally, and were particularly unpropitious to the Romans. In Rome, moreover, the Jews had some reasons for hostile feelings towards the government. Claudius, on his accession to the throne, had prohibited all large congregations of people, and among the rest, the religious assemblies of the Jews; a grievance which they, naturally, could not bear with indifference.<sup>2</sup>

When, therefore, at Rome, accounts of the appearance of the Messiah were received with increasing frequency from Palestine, it may easily have happened, that Christianity, contrary to its design, inflamed many minds, which were full of extravagant notions, and occasioned unseasonable sallies of discontent. The following passage in Suetonius seems to indicate something of this nature: "*Judæos, impulsore Chresto, assidue tumultuantes (Claudius) Româ expulit.*"<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Jos. B. J. VI. 5. Acts XVII. 7. Sueton. in Vesp. c. 4. Tacit. Hist. L. V. c. 13.

<sup>2</sup> Dio Cass. L. LVIII. p. 459. Rob. Steph.—Ed. Wechel. L. LX. p. 669.

<sup>3</sup> Suetonius, in Vit. Claudii, c. 25. That the Romans made use of the word *Chrestus* for *Christus*, is beyond a doubt. They imagined it to be the Greek word *χρηστός*, which they thus expressed, as is shown by all the Roman inscriptions in which the word *CHRESTUS* or *CHRESTE* occurs. It is with reference to this idea of the Romans, that Justin, in his Larger Apology, remarks how unjust it is to persecute the Christians for their name, while, notwithstanding, they were called *Χρηστοί*, i. e. good men (Apol. Maj. p. 136. Ed. Rob. Steph. c. 4). To this, too, reference is had in the words of Tertullian (Apologet. c. 3): "*Sed cum perperam Christianus pronunciatur a vobis . . . de suavitate et benignitate compositum est,*" where we must necessarily read *Chrestianus*, as no doubt Rigault has amended the passage, though I have not his edition at hand at this moment. The most express statement on this point is given by Lactantius (Div. Inst. L. IV. c. 17): "*Nam Christus non proprium nomen est, sed nuncupatio potestatis et regni; sic enim Judæi reges suos appellabant. Sed*



This passage is not however necessary to illustrate our Epistle, and our remarks upon it may be passed over by such as do not think that it merits a place here on any ground. Whatever may have been the cause, the Jews finally became so turbulent at Rome, that Claudius expelled them from the city. The circumstance most deserving our notice in respect to this proscription is, that the Jewish Christians likewise were comprehended in it. We have proof of this in the case of Aquila, who was banished from Rome, with the rest of the Jews, and, on this account, took up his residence at Corinth (Acts 18: 2). Consequently, no distinction was then known between a Jew and a Jewish Christian. *After the banishment of the Jewish Christians, the followers of Jesus at Rome were all converts from Paganism*; an observation to which we wish especial heed to be given.

Aquila, however, it is objected, was not then a Christian. The narrative of Luke, it seems to me, indicates that he was; for had it been the case that he was converted by Paul, and not before, his conversion would (considering his subsequent serviceableness to Paul and to the Christian church generally) have been an occurrence no less deserving of notice, than that of others who embraced Christianity at the same time (Acts 18: 7, 8).

Whatever may be thought on this point, however, I am still secure in my position, that in Rome at that time, the Jews and Jewish Christians were not yet so far distinguished from each other, that an exception would be made in favor of the latter, as to the edict issued against the Jews. How was it possible, that under Claudius, in the year in which Paul first introduced Christianity into Macedonia, and into Athens and Corinth, the Romans could have acquired such a knowledge of the new system, and its deviations from Judaism, that it should be publicly, and in the eye of the law, recognized as distinct from Judaism. Even several years after, when Paul wrote to the Jewish Christians at Rome, they themselves were not clear on this point, but were inclined to regard Christianity as a species of Judaism. The principal men, even, among the Jews in Rome, so late as the 8th year of Nero, had the idea, when Paul invited them to a conference, that it was a Jewish sect, *αἱρεσις* (Acts 28: 22), which, however, was every where spoken against; so that it would seem, the Jews and public authorities in Rome were led first, by the trial of the apostle, the accusations of his adversaries, and his replies, to understand that Christianity was a separate and peculiar religion. Lastly, if the words of Suetonius: "*Judæos, impulsore Chresto, assidue tumultuantes Româ expulit*," refer to erroneous expectations in regard to the Messiah, how can it be believed that the Jewish Christians, in particular, were exempted from the proscription?

---

exponenda est hujus nominis ratio, propter ignorantiam eorum, qui cum immutatâ litterâ Chrestum volunt dicere . . . veteres *χριστοὶ* dicebant ungi," etc. Orosius even read in his copy, "impulsore Christo assidue tumultuantes Româ expulit," and proceeds to say: "quod, utrum contra Christum tumultuantes coerceri et comprimi jusserit, an etiam Christianos simul velut cognatæ religionis homines voluerit expelli, nequâquam discernitur." (Hist. L. VII. c. 6). I find a treatise by Ammon, Super loc. Suetonii de vita Claud. c. 25, cited by others; but, unfortunately, I have not been able to get a sight of it.

## § 116.

But, even in better times, when the converts from Judaism and heathenism constituted together one religious community, there was much which was not very conducive to mutual concord. The aversion of the Jews towards the Romans may have been on many occasions more perceptible to the latter than was agreeable.

In particular, however, the Jewish ideas in regard to the Messiah were so contracted, so entirely limited to their own nation, that they regarded the heathen with little favor, as persons on whom the promises did not confer any title to their national blessings, and to whom no share in the privileges which belonged peculiarly to the children of Abraham could be granted, except they became proselytes, and then only by sufferance.

They would have had stronger reason to condemn the degenerate Romans, had they themselves been better than they actually were; but still they did thus despise them (Rom. 1: 21—2: 3). The descriptions which we have of the manners of incomparably better times than those of Claudius and Nero, which exhibited a depravity that we are, fortunately, scarce able to conceive, serve to convince us, that one need not have been very virtuous in order to find many subjects of reprobation. We will subjoin one of these pictures, drawn at a comparatively pure period of Roman morals: “Ex divitiis juventutem luxuria atque avaritia cum superbiâ invasere; rapere, consumere, sua parvi pendere, aliena cupere, pudorem, pudicitiam, divina atque humana promiscua, nîl pensi neque moderati habere . . . Sed libido stupri, ganæ, cæterique cultûs non minor incesserat. Viri pati muliebria, mulieres pudicitiam in propatulo habere,” etc.

The causes of variance, therefore, between the two parties, were amply important and numerous; and, if we have read the Epistle to the Romans with a moderate degree of attention, we shall readily recollect that its contents have been, in a great measure, determined by these causes.

## § 117.

Paul assures the Romans in his Epistle, that the intention of visiting them, which he had entertained for many years, had now become a fixed determination. *A contribution had been made in Macedonia and Achaia; this he intended to carry to Jerusalem, and then he should take his way to Rome, to see them, and to go from Rome to Spain* (Rom. 15: 23—30).

When the apostle had made arrangements at Ephesus in regard to the affairs of the church at Corinth, he prepared to depart. *It was his intention to go through Macedonia to Achaia. Thence he was going to Jerusalem; and then, said he, I must also see Rome* (Acts 19: 21). The circumstances, as thus represented in the Acts, and the purposes of the apostle, are in every respect the same which Paul mentions in his Epistle. Hence the Epistle was written at that period of his life, when, according to the Acts, he was in these circumstances and occupied with these projects.

When Paul wrote, he had finished his affairs in Macedonia and Achaia; *but now I go unto Jerusalem*, he says, *ὡνὶ δὲ πορεύομαι* (Rom. 15: 25). Unquestionably, Corinth was his place of residence in Achaia; the affairs of the church and his solemn promise led him to that city. Hence, when, after finishing his business in Achaia, he departed to return through Macedonia to Asia, and then to go to Jerusalem (Acts 20: 3), he set out from Corinth; and the Epistle, therefore, was written in that city, immediately before his departure.

Phœbe, a deaconess of Cenchrea, a suburb on the eastern harbor of Corinth, was going to Rome; and Paul commends her to the good offices of the church in that city (Rom. 16: 1). This local circumstance likewise points to Corinth, and agrees with the remark we have just made.<sup>1</sup> It is very probable that she herself undertook, as an official person in the church, the delivery of the letter.

<sup>1</sup> Semler has given to this passage, and the whole 16th chapter, a peculiar interpretation, very remote from the common one. He supposes the chapter to have been but an accompaniment to the Epistle, not intended for the readers of that, but only for the special information of the bearers, to designate the persons whom they were to visit from station to station, and with whom they were to hold private conference. This catalogue of the persons who were to be visited was afterwards appended to the Epistle itself.

The subject of the private conferences was the journey to Spain, which the apostle, in the 15th chapter, says he had resolved to undertake. This 15th chapter, likewise, which relates only to Paul's affairs, without any real connexion with what precedes, was a separate appendix, viz. the first, the 16th being considered as the second. (Semleri Paraphr. Epistolæ ad Romanos, cum notis, translatione vetustâ, et dissertat. de duplici appendice Cap. 15 et 16. Halæ. 1769.)

He interprets 16: 1 seq. as meaning that the bearers of this Epistle were to stop first at Phœbe's house in Corinth, then with Aquila, and in other places with other persons. It is certainly incomprehensible on this supposition, that Phœbe is not required to aid and accommodate the travellers who were to be her guests, but the latter to receive and assist her. He, however, refers the words, *that ye receive her* etc., *ἵνα αὐτὴν προσδέξησθε ἐν κυρίῳ ἀξίως τῶν ἁγίων*, to the travellers, and explains them as meaning: *ut eam recipiatis in communionem*. This is evidently a mere artifice. *Προσδέχεσθαι τινα ἐν κυρίῳ* means elsewhere (Philipp. 2: 29), to receive one kindly and in accordance with Christian brotherhood; just as *τινα προπέμπειν ἀξίως τοῦ θεοῦ* (3 Ep. John 6) signifies, to forward one's journey as is suitable in behalf of fellow-worshippers of God.

They are afterwards to go to Aquila, likewise, to hold conference with him. That this may be conveniently done, Semler provides him with a house at Corinth. We know that Rome was Aquila's proper place of abode, before Claudius expelled the Jews from the city (Acts 18: 1, 2). When he was exiled, he went first to Corinth, and then with Paul to Ephesus; in the latter place he procured himself a house to live in, containing a hall in which Christians were wont to assemble; there was an *ἐκκλησία* in his house (1 Cor. 16: 19, 20). Now on what particular authority the third or Semlerian house at Corinth rests, I know not. The appeal in its behalf to Acts 18: 27. 19: 1; "*Lucas enim scribit—cum Aquila interea Corinthi versatus sit*" etc., is an inadvertent one; for the person there spoken of is Apollos. And now I think I may be spared further argument in refutation of this hypothesis.

Two observations made by Bertholdt (Einl. 6th Th. § 715. p. 3303), are to the point. The salutation subjoined at the end by Tertius with the words, *ὁ γράψας τὴν ἐπιστολὴν* (Rom. 16: 22), proves that the whole is but one composition, a single Epistle. As to the passage: *Τῷ δὲ δυναμένῳ κ. τ. λ.*, which occurs in many Mss. at the end (Rom. 16: 25—27), but in most is read after 14: 23, the case is as follows. Since the salutations, after which this passage stood in the oldest Mss., were not read in the church-lessons, it was necessary either to resign the passage, beautiful as it was, or to remove it from its position and place



Paul's last visit to Corinth and his departure for Jerusalem took place in the middle of the 5th year of Nero. Hence the Epistle was written in this year.

### § 118.

After Paul had been compelled by the uproar against him to flee from Ephesus, Aquila likewise departed from the city. The dangers to which he was there exposed, on account of his connexion with the apostle (Rom. 16: 4), rendered it impossible for him to remain longer in so insecure a situation. He therefore returned to Rome, which was properly his home. Here Paul supposed him to be, when he wrote his Epistle, and greets him accordingly (Rom. 16: 3).

For, Claudius being dead, and the commencement of Nero's reign being characterized by such mildness and humanity that the best of princes could say of it: *distare cunctos principes Neronis quinquennio*,<sup>1</sup> the Jews gradually acquired sufficient confidence to return. Paul, when he despaired of safety in Greece and Asia, intended to reside at Rome till his departure for Spain. Several of Paul's kinsmen were at that time in Rome (Rom. 16: 7, 11); or even supposing that the *συγγενεῖς*, who are mentioned, were only fellow-countrymen, the circumstance proves all we desire, viz. that the Jewish Christians had returned to the city.

This occurrence was so important that it could not escape the notice of the apostle. *The Roman church, which, for a long time after the proscription of the Jews, consisted exclusively of converts from Paganism, now regained its former members, and was, as it were, established and organized anew.* It was now the right moment to induce more thorough concord between the two parties, to rebut the Jewish prejudices and pretensions, which had formerly disturbed the peace and harmony of the church, and to create such a mutual good understanding, as would ensure to the church of Christ in the metropolis of the world a permanent duration for all future time. Such was the object, and such is the tendency, of the Epistle to the Romans.

Hence the prevalent idea throughout is that, in the sight of God, Jew and Gentile are alike; that the prerogatives, rights, and vices of both are the same. And, if there ever did subsist a distinction between them, in the eye of Him who looks upon the whole human race with equal benevolence, it has been abolished by Christ, who unites all, far and near, under one common religion. The Epistle was addressed particularly to the Jewish Christians. A concise exhibition of its contents will fully sustain this assertion.

---

it further back. The latter step was chosen. But the section immediately preceding already contained a doxology: *ὁ θεὸς πατὴρ ἐξ ὁλης* etc. (15: 33); and hence it was removed still further back to 14: 23, where it is found in all the *Lectio-naria*, and almost all the Mss. written in the cursive character.

<sup>1</sup> Aurel. Victor. L. II. c. 5.



## § 119.

The Greeks ("Ἕλληνες, says Paul, out of forbearance towards the Romans,) might have known God from the works of nature. This they failed to do, and therefore fell into enormous vices (1: 18—32).

But the Jews have not, on this account, any reason to regard themselves as better than the Gentiles, inasmuch as they themselves are guilty of the same transgressions (—2: 9).

Inference. Jews and Gentiles are deserving of punishment if they are sinful, and of reward if virtuous. In the sight of God there is no distinction between them (—2: 12).

\* \* \* \* \*

It is true, the heathen have no written law; but they have, instead, the law of nature and of the heart to guide them (—2: 16).

The Jews had a written law, but did not follow its guidance (—2: 25).

Do they found their prerogatives upon circumcision? This is nothing without an observance of the law. The circumcision of the flesh is nothing at all in comparison with that of the heart (—3:).

The Jews may, it is true, boast that the revelation of God was committed to them; but this only serves to put to shame their disobedience to its dictates (—3: 21).

Now, however, a new illumination has taken place of the ancient revelation; faith has taken place of the law. The former has, through Jesus, a justifying efficacy, which the latter has not; it operates in favor of both Jews and Gentiles, and God is the God of both (—4:).

The Jews imagine further, that they have an exclusive title to the divine promises. They were made to Abraham and his posterity, and therefore appropriately belong to the children of Abraham. But were not these promises made to Abraham on account of his faith, before the circumcision, when he was as yet a Gentile? Is he not, then, the father of the circumcised and uncircumcised, of all who like him have faith (—5:).

The case, then, stands thus. By faith in Jesus and by his atonement alone we have obtained grace from God, and shall receive yet more hereafter (—5: 12).

There is therefore, an analogy between Christ and Adam. In the law of nature, or in heathenism, from Adam down to Moses, and in Judaism from Moses downward, all have been sinners in Adam on account of one sin. Through Jesus, in like manner, all receive pardon, not for one only but for every offence (—6:).

In baptism we were symbolically buried with Jesus, became dead to sin, and consequently began a new life of freedom from sin under a dispensation of grace (—7:).

As being dead persons, the law ceases to have any obligation upon us. Its binding force continues only till death, as is shown by the regulations of the marriage institution (—7: 7).

The law is indeed useful, but of very imperfect utility. It increases knowledge; but, as the passions of mankind lead them astray in spite of their knowledge, it also increases guilt (—8:).

Jesus delivered us from this law of sin, and promulgated the dispensation of grace. He elevated the soul to a mastery over its propensi-

ties; he procured us the indulgence and favor of God, and pointed out to us a recompense for all the struggles of this earthly life, an inheritance which animates our courage (—9:).

\* \* \* \* \*

I indeed feel sorrow, that the Jews, my brethren, on whom their birth and the promises appeared to have conferred a peculiar claim to the Messiah, should have failed to profit by it. But it is of vastly more consequence to be a son of Abraham according to faith, than merely according to the flesh. This is shown by the example of Isaac and Ishmael. God is not restricted by any rights of birth, as we are taught by the account concerning Esau and Jacob. No requisition can be made of him; all is of grace, which he dispenses wisely, though the wisdom may not be apparent to the eye of man (—9: 29).

God can give the Gentiles the preference, if they believe and love righteousness, as he can reject the Jews, if they will not listen to the Gospel. It was proclaimed to all alike, both Jews and Gentiles (—11:).

All hope is not lost, however, to the unbelieving Jews. Though for the present the Gentiles are preferred by God, they have no cause for arrogance. They are branches grafted into a foreign stock, which may be torn off to give place to the natural branches. No one can penetrate the divine intentions (—11: 36).

You now form together one common body. I exhort you, therefore, to mutual harmony, beneficence, and love (—13:).

Obeys and honor the magistrate and the laws; for it becomes us to exhibit an honest and irreproachable deportment (—14:).

Let no one give offence to others by the heedless use of meats offered in sacrifice; exercise forbearance towards one another, and edify one another; be ye all, Jews and Gentiles, as disciples of Jesus Christ, of one mind, to the glory of God (—15: 14).

I have indeed devoted myself to the welfare of the Gentiles; but my office as apostle of the Gentiles requires me to do so (—15: 22).

Purpose of visiting Rome and Spain (—16:).

Recommendation of Phœbe to the good offices of the Roman church; and salutations to individuals in it. Conclusion.

## § 120.

### THE EPISTLE TO THE EPHESIANS.

Paul had determined to go to Rome as soon as he should have finished his affairs at Jerusalem, and he did indeed go thither, not as he intended, however, but in fetters and bonds. He was seized at Jerusalem, carried to Cæsarea, kept there in prison two years, and at last sent to Rome to appear before the emperor's tribunal. From the capital, where he continued in prison as many years more, he wrote several Epistles; those to the Ephesians, the Colossians, and Philemon, as is clear from their contents, and also that to the Philippians.

It is difficult to determine the order of time in which the three first-

named Epistles were written, as the apostle does not mention, either in the one to the Ephesians or the one to the Colossians, the circumstances in which he was placed, but in each of them refers to Tychicus, who was to give them verbal information in regard to his situation (Eph. 6: 21, 22. Coloss. 4: 7, 8).

It is an argument which goes to shew that the Epistle to the Ephesians was composed first, that Paul has not prefixed the name of Timothy to it after his own, as he has in the Epistles to the Colossians and to Philemon, and in all the Epistles which he wrote when his faithful assistant was at his side. On account of this invariable custom of the apostle, we may infer with certainty that Timothy had not yet arrived at Rome, that he was not in Paul's company, as he was when Paul wrote to the Colossians, to Philemon, and to the Philippians. He was called to the capital by the fate of his master, and shared that fate with him till his liberation (Heb. 13: 23). A second argument will be added, when we come to discuss the doubts which have recently been raised concerning the second Epistle to Timothy (§ 137).

### § 121.

This Epistle is indeed at present directed to the Ephesians; but it would seem from the account of the ancients, that in the introduction (Eph. 1: 1) the words *ἐν Ἐφέσῳ*, designating the city, were formerly wanting.

Basil of Cappadocia maintains against Eunomius, as to the question, whether it can be said that the Son of God was begotten *ἐξ οὐκ ὄντων*, that he is even the *ὄντως ὄν*, and that this predicate is the rather applicable to him, as even those who know and reverence him are called *οἱ ὄντες*, while, on the contrary, the Gentiles, who know not the only true God and his Son, are called *οὐκ ὄντα*.

For, he says, the apostle Paul, in his Epistle to the Ephesians, calls believers *ὄντας*, addressing *τοῖς ἀγίοις τοῖς οὖσιν καὶ πιστοῖς ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ* (1: 1). He gave them this denomination, he says, *ἰδιαζόντως*, exclusively or peculiarly, as was attested by ancient fathers, and by Mss. in which he himself (Basil) found the passage to read thus.<sup>1</sup>

As Basil maintains such a position from this passage, and appeals in confirmation of his reading to ancient fathers and ancient Mss., there must have been something peculiar in his reading. Now we observe that Basil omits in the apostle's text the words *ἐν Ἐφέσῳ*: *τοῖς ἀγίοις τοῖς οὖσιν*—*καὶ πιστοῖς ἐν Χριστῷ*.

Clear as this point is, it has been attempted to involve it in difficulty, on which account we have been compelled to devote further attention to

<sup>1</sup> Καὶ γὰρ ποῦ ἑτέρῳ δι' αὐτὸς οὗτος ἀπόστολος, ὁ ἐν πνεύματι Θεοῦ λαλῶν, μὴ ὄντα ὀνομάζει τὰ ἔθνη διὰ τὸ τῆς γνώσεως τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐστερηθῆναι, εἰπὼν ὅτι τὰ μὴ ὄντα ἐξελέξατο ὁ Θεός. Ἐπεὶ γὰρ ὢν καὶ ἀλήθεια καὶ ἰωὴ ὁ Θεός, οἱ τῷ Θεῷ τῷ ὄντι μὴ ἡνόμενοι κατὰ τὴν πίστιν, τῇ δὲ ἀνυπαξία τοῦ ψευδοῦς οἰκουμενιστῆς διὰ τῆς περὶ τὰ εἰδωλα πλάνης, εἰκότως, οἶμαι, διὰ τὴν στέρησιν τῆς ἀληθείας, καὶ ἀπὸ τῆς ζωῆς ἀλλοτριώσιν μὴ ὄντες προσεγορεύθησαν. Ἀλλὰ καὶ τοῖς Ἐφεσίοις ἐπιστέλλων ὡς γνησίως ἡνωμένοις τῷ ὄντι δι' ἐπιγνώσεως, ὄντας αὐτοὺς ἰδιαζόντως ἀνύμασεν, εἰπὼν· τοῖς ἀγίοις τοῖς οὖσι καὶ πιστοῖς ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ· οὕτω γὰρ καὶ οἱ πρὸ ἡμῶν παραδεδώκασι, καὶ ἡμεῖς ἐν τοῖς παλαιοῖς τῶν ἀντιγράφων εὐρήκαμεν.

it. It has been thought preferable to suppose a different peculiarity from the one represented in Basil.<sup>1</sup>

A learned writer wishes to persuade us that probably the word οὔσι was wanting in some Mss. of Paul's text, and because the father depended particularly on this expression as proof that the apostle had called Christians ὄντας, he appealed to Mss. and other authorities in support of it. But if this was all Basil wanted, he might have gained his point much more easily, by appealing to some other Epistle of Paul; e. g. that to the Romans, Corinthians, Colossians, or Philippians, in which he might have found an abundance of such expressions: τοῖς οὔσιν ἐν Ῥώμῃ, τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ τῇ οὔσῃ ἐν Κορίνθῳ, τοῖς οὔσιν ἐν Φιλιπποῖς, τοῖς οὔσιν ἐν Κολοσσαῖς, etc.

But the argument which Basil founds on Ephes. 1: 1 is of such a nature that he cannot have read the words ἐν Ἐφέσῳ after τοῖς οὔσι. For he is speaking of the predicate ὁ ὢν in its absolute signification, that signification in which it expresses the abstract idea of existence, and belongs, in its highest degree and in every conception of time, to God; not of εἶμι in the signification of *being or dwelling in a place*. Now, the moment the words ἐν Ἐφέσῳ are added, the ὄντες can no longer be regarded as the ascription of an attribute of God by virtue of which he is called ὁ ὢν, as the writer regarded it, but the ὄντες ἐν Ἐφέσῳ are merely, persons resident in Ephesus. It is clear, then, that he could not possibly have read what his citation now wants in all Mss., and yet have argued as he does.<sup>2</sup>

A similar observation, made by Jerome on Eph. 1: 1 affords further evidence that ἐν Ἐφέσῳ was not always found in the text of the apostle. He says, some interpret Paul here as intending to designate believers, *essentiæ vocabulo, ut ab eo qui est qui sunt appellantur*; others, however, suppose that he wrote, not *ad eos qui sunt*, but *ad eos qui sunt Ephesi*.

The question, therefore, was, whether *ad eos qui sunt* was to be taken as having no reference to place, which could never have been imagined by any one, if the place had been expressed in the text if the reading

<sup>1</sup> The question what Basil's language really was depends on the Mss. of his works. These are not at my command; but our Library, which is rich in typographical antiquities, affords me substitutes for them, which will decide this question. The first Greek edition of Basil (1532 fol. apud Froben. Basileæ, per Des. Erasm.) does not contain the books against Eunomius. The *Editio princeps*, therefore, of these books, is the Venetian one of 1535, fol. This gives the passage (p. 127) exactly as I have cited it. The *secunda* (i. e. of the work against Eunomius) appeared at Basle, *apud Froben.* 1551, fol. and is a complete edition of all his works. Janus Cornarius edited the work, and did it, as he says in his dedication to Julius, Bishop of Naumburg, *πρὸς παλαιότατα ἀρχέτυπα*. In this, too, the passage stands as I have given it (p. 668). Fronton Ducæus, in his edition of this father (Paris 1618), and Combefisius, in his ("Basilus Magnus ex integro recensitus ex fide optimor. Cod." etc. Paris. II vols. in 8vo. 1679), discovered no variation in the Mss.; and lastly, Garnier, likewise, who has collected all the information on this subject in his note L. II. Adv. Eunom. T. I. p. 254, found no such discrepancy.

<sup>2</sup> Those who infer that Basil read the words ἐν Ἐφέσῳ from the fact that he cites this Epistle as the Epistle to the Ephesians: τοῖς Ἐφεσίοις ἐπιστέλλον, should recollect that he was obliged to give it some name, and therefore gave it the usual one, as it is cited by others also in the same way, who still maintain that the words ἐν Ἐφέσῳ were originally wanting.



were *qui sunt Ephesi*; or whether it was to be interpreted with a local reference, as to which there could have been no doubt, had not the place been really omitted in some copies.<sup>1</sup>

Further, Marcion is charged by Tertullian with having altered the inscription (*titulum*) of this Epistle, and prefixed to it the title *ad Laodiceños*, contrary to the custom of the church, according to which it was inscribed *ad Ephesios*. Hence the words *ἐν Ἐφέσῳ* cannot have stood in the text of Eph. 1: 1; for, in case they had, the inscription would have been contradicted by the Epistle, or else he must have altered the words in the text itself, which Tertullian, who is not wont to overlook any of his misdemeanors, has not accused him of doing.<sup>2</sup> Moreover, they are in fact not found in the text of the celebrated Vatican Ms.; being merely in the margin, though by the first hand.<sup>3</sup>

The apostle, too, proceeds in this Epistle so much like a stranger, and treats his readers as so ignorant in regard to his office and the nature of his commission, that he could merely think it probable *they might have heard that he was the apostle of the Gentiles, that a gracious dispensation towards the Gentiles was given him of God, that he was instructed by special revelations and endowed with knowledge, in order that he might teach them* (Eph. 3: 1, 2, 3). The Ephesians, however, were not thus ignorant of him and his vocation; for he had founded their church, had resided among them more than two years and a half, had become acquainted with each individual, and, as he says (Acts 20: 31), had often warned every one of them with tears.

The author of the Synopsis which is found among the works of Athanasius, perceived plainly the distant and general character of the Epistle, and concluded, in spite of historical evidence to the contrary, that when Paul wrote it he had not yet seen the Ephesians, and had only received oral information respecting them.<sup>4</sup>

Now, since the Epistle did not contain the name of any place at the commencement, as the other Epistles of Paul which were directed to whole churches did; since its style is so distant and its whole purport so general; it is less likely to have been written for the Ephesians in particular, than for several churches at once. Archbishop Usher's supposition is the best explanation which we have of its destination and object. He thinks it was an encyclical letter, which was directed to several churches of Asia Minor at the same time. Hence a vacant space

<sup>1</sup> Comment. in Ep. ad Ephes. "Quidam curiosius, quam necesse est, putant ex eo, quod Mosis dictum sit: Hæc dices filiis Israel, *qui est* misit me, etiam eos, qui Ephesi sunt, sancti et fideles essentiæ vocabulo nuncupatos, ut ab eo *qui est*, hi *qui sunt* appellentur. Alii vero simpliciter non ad eos *qui sunt*, sed *qui Ephesi* sancti et fideles *sunt*, scriptum arbitrantur." Comp. Not. Vallarsii ad h. l.

Tertull. L. V. Adv. Marcion. c. 17. "Ecclesiæ quidem veritate epistolam istam ad Ephesios habemus emissam, non ad Laodiceños: sed Marcion ei *titulum* aliquando interpolare gestiit, quasi et in isto diligentissimus explorator. Nihil autem de titulis interest, cum ad omnes apostolus scripserit, dum ad quosdam." And, L. V. c. 11. "Prætereo hic et de aliâ epistolâ quam nos *ad Ephesios* per-scriptam habemus, hæretici vero *ad Laodiceños*." Comp. Koppe, Nov. Test. Perpet. Annot. Illustr. Vol. VI. Prol. ad Eph. p. 5—7, Ed. Tychsen.

<sup>3</sup> Hug, De antiquitate Codicis Vaticani, p. 26.

<sup>4</sup> Ταύτην, πρὸς Ἐφεσίους, ἐπιστέλλει ἀπὸ Ρώμης, οὕτω μὲν αὐτοὺς ἐνορακῶς, ἀκούσας δὲ μόνον περὶ αὐτῶν.

was left for the name of the place, that it might be filled up by the reader, according to the church in which it was read: *Παῦλος, ἀπόστολος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ διὰ θελήματος θεοῦ, τοῖς ἁγίοις τοῖς οὖν . . . καὶ πιστοῖς κ. τ. λ.*

Yet it was necessary that it should appear among Paul's Epistles under some definite name which should be agreed upon, in order that no uncertainty respecting it, or pretence on the part of such as might claim the honor of having received it, might occasion difficulty in forming a collection or in regard to the canon. It was therefore inscribed, *Πρὸς Ἐφεσίους*, because Ephesus was the chief, or the first, Asiatic city which received it (Ephes. 5: 19. 2 Tim. 4: 12). After a time, moreover, the words *ἐν Ἐφέσῳ* came to be inserted in the text itself, and, on the authority of the inscription, were admitted into many Mss.

### § 122.

The contents are as follows: Paul at the commencement extols the value and advantages of Christianity, the dignity of its founder, and the benefits which those to whom the Epistle was directed had received from it (—2:). He then refers to himself as the minister of this universal blessing, mentions his bonds, which he endured particularly for the Gentiles, and exhorts them to become more and more rooted and grounded in the sublime doctrines of the Gospel (—4:). After these preparatory remarks, he enjoins upon them union in doctrine and external worship, and tells them that, however different may be the station of individual members in the church, this very difference is intended only to promote their unity as a body (—4: 17). He now passes to their deportment, and requires that it be worthy of their high calling; speaks of amendment, of meekness, concord, and beneficence (—5:). He then enlarges particularly upon fornication, and other vices of the Gentiles.

From 5: 21—6: 10 he treats of the duties of married and domestic life, of the husband, the wife, children, and servants. In conclusion, he exhorts them again to constancy under a state of things peculiarly perilous to Christianity, and adds a salutation.

### § 123.

#### THE EPISTLE TO THE COLOSSIANS.

Colosse was one of the principal cities of Phrygia, concerning which, however, the ancients have given us but little information. Not long after Paul wrote thither, in the latter part of Nero's reign, it was overwhelmed by an earthquake.<sup>1</sup> In some Mss. it is called Colasse, and this reading has been so much liked, that many have alway cited the

<sup>1</sup> Plin. Hist. Nat. L. V. c. 41. Oros. Hist. L. VIII. c. 7. Xenophon (De Exp. Cyri, L. I. c. 2. n. 6) speaks of *Κολοσσάς, πόλιν οἰκουμένην, ἐνδαίμονα, καὶ μεγάλην*.

Epistle accordingly. We, however, invariably find on the coins of this city *ΚΟΛΟΣΣΗΝΟΙ*, and *ΑΙΜΟΣ ΚΟΛΟΣΣΗΝΩΝ*.

Paul had not taught here himself; they were acquainted with Christianity probably only through his disciples, and with Paul himself only from oral information. One of their principal teachers was Epaphras, upon whom certain preachers of false doctrines were desirous of casting odium. Paul protected him, however, with his authority, and expressed his approval of him and his doctrines (Col. 1: 7. 4: 12, 13).

### § 124.

Paul did not write this Epistle until after that to the Ephesians; for Timothy had arrived at Rome (Col. 1: 1), a consolation which he did not enjoy when he wrote the latter Epistle, as we have remarked in the proper place. Tychicus carried both of these Epistles to Asia, but at different times; first, as I imagine, that to the Ephesians and the second to Timothy (2 Tim. 4: 12), and then those to the Colossians and Philemon. The first two were written at the commencement of his imprisonment; one before his trial, and the other shortly after it, at which latter period his prospects were sad and gloomy, as described in the Epistle to Timothy. The last two were written sometime in the following year, when his prospects began to brighten; for, in the Epistle to Philemon, which was despatched with that to the Colossians, the apostle anticipates his speedy liberation, and holds out to his friend the hope that he will soon visit him (Philemon, v. 22). Such are the conclusions to which I have arrived in regard to the time when these Epistles were sent; and I shall establish them more fully when I come to discuss the second Epistle to Timothy.

### § 125.

At the beginning of the Epistle he commends their faith and love, and the instructions of Epaphras, and assures them of his prayers on their behalf. He then extols the benefits bestowed by Jesus Christ, declares him to be the Creator, Lord of the spiritual world and of all existences, and the enlightener of the Gentiles (—1: 24). He then speaks of himself as an ambassador of Jesus, and of his bonds, which he bore for the Gospel and its followers, even for those whom he had never seen, and, taking occasion from his own sufferings, exhorts them to adhere with unwavering confidence to their first instruction, and to beware of heresies (—2: 12). He represents to them that, having been symbolically buried with Christ in baptism, having become dead to the follies of human opinions, they should now labor to elevate their minds to a new and loftier sphere, should aspire after a celestial mode of life, and constantly aim to exhibit innocence, uprightness, forbearance and meekness (—3: 18).

He then treats of the duties of the wife, the husband, children and servants, and exhorts them to prayer. He closes with salutations, and an injunction to communicate this Epistle to the Laodiceans, and to read that from Laodicea at Colosse.

## § 126.

## OF THE EPISTLE TO THE LAODICEANS.

We are in possession of an Epistle directed to the Laodiceans, and claiming to have been written by Paul.<sup>1</sup> No great philological knowledge or acquaintance with higher criticism is needed, to enable one to pass sentence against this miserable composition. We cannot discover, in all the remains which we have of the early times of Christianity, the slightest evidence that the ancients were ever acquainted with any more valuable writing under this name, any writing worthy of regard or respecting which they thought it worth while to express so much as a lenient doubt.<sup>2</sup>

It has even been denied that the Epistle to the Laodiceans ever existed; though, it would seem, in contradiction to the testimony of Paul (Col. 4: 16). He says: When this Epistle is read among you, cause that it be read also in the church of the Laodiceans, and that ye likewise read the one from Laodicea: καὶ τὴν ἐκ Λαοδικείας ἵνα καὶ ὑμεῖς ἀναγνῶτε.

On this Chrysostom and Theodoret remark, in their Commentaries, that some think the words refer to an Epistle which the church at Laodicea had written to the apostle. For the expression is, τὴν ἐκ Λαοδικείας, that *from* Laodicea, not τὴν πρὸς τοὺς Λαοδικεῖς, that *to* the Laodiceans. Many others have been of the same opinion.

The words may, however, have either signification, and they present an equally harsh ellipsis in either case; whether we suppose them to mean, Cause the Epistle to be brought from Laodicea, *which the church has received from me*, or, Cause the Epistle from Laodicea to be brought to you, *which the church wrote to me*.

But, if there was not an equal exchange of two apostolic Epistles, and ἡ ἐκ Λαοδικείας denotes an Epistle which the Laodiceans had sent to the apostle, why does Paul enjoin that this letter to him should also be communicated to the Colossians? Did he wish to make the Laodiceans teachers of the Colossians, and to present their sentiments as an example and standard for the latter? As we cannot believe that this was the case, the injunction can have been given only because one Epistle had reference to the contents of the other, and was requisite to a thorough understanding of it.

The contents of Paul's Epistle to the Colossians, then, must have been of such a nature, that it could not be understood without that which the Laodiceans had previously sent to the apostle, and it was therefore necessary that the latter should be read with it. But then it is strange that Paul should write to the Colossians what particularly concerned the Laodiceans; that he made no reply to the Laodiceans,

<sup>1</sup> Fabric. Cod. Apocr. N. T. P. II. p. 853. P. III. p. 710.

<sup>2</sup> Anonym. apud Murator. Antiqq. Ital. Med. Aevi, T. III. p. 853. Hieronym. Script. Eccles. v. Paulus.



who, however, would not have written to him without cause, wrote to the former what they could not understand, and did not at all to the latter, who might have understood him.

Besides, the Epistle to the Colossians has no apparent reference to prior Epistle from any quarter; it refers only to oral accounts. It refers to what the apostle had heard respecting the condition and affairs of the Colossian church (Col. 1: 3), ἀκούσαντες, and expressly mentions Epaphras, δηλώσας κ. τ. λ. (Col. 1: 8, 9), as having been the author of the information.

It is, therefore, impossible in every point of view, to suppose that the apostle had an Epistle from the Laodiceans before him when he wrote his Epistle to the Colossians, and composed the latter with special reference to it; and we must explain τὴν ἐκ Λαοδικείας, as denoting an Epistle of Paul which he had written to that city, and which was to be communicated by the Laodiceans to the Colossians, as the latter were required to do the like in return.

But where then is this Epistle? What became of it at so early a period that nothing was known of it by any of the ancient writers? How could the Epistle to the Laodiceans perish, while that to the Colossians is preserved? If the Laodiceans did resign it to oblivion, we see that the Colossians have handed theirs down to posterity, and when that to the Laodiceans came into such careful hands, how happened it that it was not preserved with the other?

Of these difficulties, which are as urgent as they are well-founded, there is no better solution than the ingenious hypothesis which was first propounded, I believe, by Hugo Grotius. He considers the Epistle to the Laodiceans to have been the same as that which is now termed the Epistle to the Ephesians. This was directed to several churches in Asia Minor, and particularly to such as had not seen the apostle, among which he himself reckons the Laodiceans (Col. 2: 1). Marcion gave it the title, Πρὸς τοὺς Λαοδικεῖς, whence it appears that it was supposed by some in ancient times to have been specially intended for the Laodiceans; for we shall readily be convinced that Marcion intended a correction rather than a falsification, if we only reflect that he could have had no motive for the latter in this case. The relative situation of the places, too, was such as to make it most natural that the Colossians should be directed to Laodicea to procure the so-called Epistle to the Ephesians. The hypothesis, therefore, not only has the recommendation of solving the above difficulties, but has, likewise, peculiar internal probability.

## § 127.

### THE EPISTLE TO PHILEMON.

The apostle was visited at Rome by Onesimus, a fugitive slave of Philemon; he effected his conversion, and sent him back, with a recommendation, to his master. Although Paul was restoring property which was then of considerable value, and was, moreover, returning it

to its owner in an improved condition, and although the services of such a man must then have been extremely acceptable, and the friendly relation between him and the master of the slave would seem to have justified his retention, he sent him back with all the delicacy of refined society, and gave him a recommendation to his master.

Thy faith and love, Philemon, he writes, are a very great consolation to me. I send thee thy fugitive slave, whom I converted in prison. Gladly as I should have retained him to minister unto me, I would not do so without leave from thee. Receive him, forgive him, treat him as a brother; for such he has become by becoming a Christian. I hope soon to see thee. I salute thee, as do all who are with me.

This Epistle and that to the Colossians were sent at the same time, viz. when Onesimus returned to his master (Philem. 10: 11, 12. Coloss. 4: 7, 8, 9). In both Epistles we find the same persons with Paul, viz. Timothy, Aristarchus, who was Paul's fellow-prisoner, Marcus, Lucas, Demas, and Epaphras (Philem. 23. Coloss. 4: 10, 12, 14).

## § 128.

### THE SECOND EPISTLE TO TIMOTHY.

This, in my opinion, was written during Paul's first imprisonment at Rome, after that to the Ephesians, and between those to the Colossians and Philemon. Learned men, however, have referred its composition to his second Roman imprisonment, the circumstances of which are wholly unknown to us. As might be expected from their knowledge and erudition, they do not want arguments in support of their position.

It is certain that the Epistles to the Ephesians, Colossians and Philemon were composed during the first imprisonment at Rome, and, moreover, in the order in which we have named them. Now there are some circumstances brought to view in these Epistles, which individualize the first imprisonment, and which we must notice, for the purpose of comparing them with those which may be gathered from the second Epistle to Timothy.

At the beginning of the imprisonment, when the Epistle to the Ephesians was written, Timothy, who was not one of Paul's companions on the voyage to Italy (Acts 27: 2), was not with him at Rome; for Paul does not add his name in the address with which the Epistle commences, as he always did when Timothy was at his side. Timothy afterwards arrived; and, accordingly, at the outset of the Epistles to the Colossians and Philemon, his name appears with the apostle's (Col. 1: 1. Philem. 1). 2dly. Luke was in Paul's company (Col. 4: 14. Philem. 24). 3dly. Mark was likewise with him (Col. 4: 10. Philem. 24). 4thly. Tychicus was then Paul's *διάκονος* and letter-bearer, and, in particular, was sent to Asia (Eph. 4: 21. Col. 4: 7, 8).

All these circumstances are presented to view in the 2d Epistle to Timothy. Timothy was not with Paul at first; but was summoned to his side (2 Tim. 4: 9, 21). 2dly, Luke was with him (2 Tim. 4: 11). 3dly, He wishes Mark to come with Timothy; so that he must have

been with him in the course of his imprisonment (2 Tim. 4: 11). 4thly, Tychicus was with him, in the capacity of letter-bearer, and, in particular, was sent to Asia (2 Tim. 4: 12).

Now, in order to suppose that Paul wrote this Epistle to Timothy during a second imprisonment at Rome, we must assume that the circumstances of both were precisely the same; we must suppose that at each time Timothy was not at first with the apostle, but joined him afterwards; that Mark was with him each time, and likewise Luke; and that each time Tychicus was Paul's *διάκονος* and letter-bearer, and was sent to Asia.

We must, moreover, assume that Paul, at both times, even in the latter part of Nero's reign, was permitted to receive friends during his confinement, to write letters, despatch messengers, and, in general, to have free intercourse with every body. And yet, even in his first imprisonment, this permission was only a happy accident, and would never have been granted, had it not been for the specially courteous and friendly disposition of the centurion, Julius (Acts 38: 16. Comp. 27: 3). The *custodia libera*, or *ἀδελφός*, in the houses of magistrates, was allowed only to Romans of distinguished rank. The *custodia apud vades* could be permitted only for special reasons, respecting which the magistrate was to judge. In the *custodia militaris*, the prisoner was given in charge to a centurion, and chained to a soldier. We may readily conceive how much one could write in such a situation, how easily he could receive and send away letters and messengers, if the centurion did not treat him with special favor. And yet in the milder days of Nero's reign this was the confinement which fell to the apostle's lot. If a worse fate, the *Carcer*, was allotted him in his second imprisonment, as it is to be feared it was, at a time when no ill-treatment was sufficiently severe for the Christians, he must have been fortunate if he was not compelled to surrender the light of day.<sup>1</sup>

As we have said, the *custodia militaris* was the apostle's lot. On arriving at Rome, Julius delivered up his prisoners to the *Præfectus prætorio*, *Στρατοπεδάρχης*. At the beginning of the 8th year of Nero, Burrhus held this office; at his death two persons were appointed to succeed him, Fenius Rufus and Sofonius Tigellinus. Tacitus relates that the death of Burrhus occurred in the 8th year of Nero. The decease of this confessedly upright man created the more consternation, as little good could be anticipated from the listless harmlessness of one of his successors, or the insatiable depravity of the other, the latter of whom in the sequel gained Nero's entire confidence and an exorbitant degree of power. Seneca soon felt the change in the atmosphere of the court, and retired from it, in the same year that his friend died, which he calls, in his address to the Emperor, the 8th of his reign.<sup>2</sup>

The apostle was permitted to dwell by himself, with a soldier who guarded him (Acts 28: 16). This distinction was an extraordinary favor. Much, however, depended still on the good-humor of the centurion who had charge of him, and of the guard to whom, for the time be-

<sup>1</sup> Lipsius, in not. ad Tacit. Ann. L. V. c. 3. and in excursu B. ad Tacit. Ann. L. III.

<sup>2</sup> Tacit. Ann. L. XIV. c. 53.



ing, he was chained. Lastly, the free communication with others, which Paul enjoyed, was a privilege possessed by few prisoners.

How difficult it was to obtain such privileges in altered circumstances, we see from the case of Herod Agrippa, who owed it to interference from the highest quarter, that the *Præf. prætorio* assigned the charge of him to a more courteous centurion, chained him to less brutal guards, and connived at the visit of a few friends, and the procuring of a few conveniences under cover of the darkness of night.<sup>1</sup>

### § 129.

Though the identity of the situation and chain of circumstances points so clearly to one and the same imprisonment, it is still said by those who transfer the composition of this Epistle to the second imprisonment, that there are some indications in it which do not at all accord with the first.

Paul says: *Erastus abode at Corinth; but Trophimus have I left at Miletus sick* (2 Tim. 4: 20). Now this is a wholly different route from the one which Luke states to have been taken on the first voyage to Italy. On that occasion Paul sailed to Sidon, thence to Cyprus, then along the coast of Cilicia, Pamphylia, and Lycia, was driven to Crete, and did not come within ten German miles of Miletus; and, so far from going to Corinth, was driven by the storm towards Africa, and carried to Malta (Acts 27: 3—44).

But Paul does not here say that he went to Corinth, but only that Erastus remained there, where he was an officer of the church: *ἔμεινε ἐν Κορίνθῳ*. This he might say, if Erastus was expected at Rome, on account of a promise or out of friendship, and had not come according to anticipation.

As to Trophimus, the passage would be of more weight if it necessarily meant: *I left him sick at Miletus*. It runs, thus: *Τρόφιμον δὲ ἀπέλιπον ἐν Μιλήτῳ ἀσθενούντα*. These words may mean: *they left Trophimus at Miletus sick*.

Many churches had sent delegates to the apostle with supplies, and likewise as *amici* and *deprecatores*, who, according to Greek and Roman usage, were to accompany the accused *in causâ capitali* to his trial (2 Tim. 4: 16). The duty of affection to support a friend at a trial was sacred among the Romans, and still more so among Christians. Observe how Lucian ridicules the zeal of the Christians when one of their teachers was in prison; describing them as sending deputies to him from the cities of Asia at the common cost, to console and assist him on his trial.<sup>2</sup> In this way came Epaphroditus (Philipp. 4: 18), Epaphras (Col. 4: 12, 13), and Onesiphorus (2 Tim. 1: 16, 17). Many came from Asia, who, notwithstanding, pusillanimously left the apostle to his fate (2 Tim. 1: 15). Thus, too, Erastus ought to have come from Corinth, either as a friend, on his own account, or commissioned by the church, in behalf of which Paul had done so much.

<sup>1</sup> Joseph. Antiqq. L. XVIII. c. 6. § 7.

<sup>2</sup> Καὶ μὴν καὶ τῶν ἐν Ἀσίᾳ πόλεων ἔστιν, ὧν ἑκὼν τινες τῶν Χριστιανῶν στείλοντων ἀπὸ τοῦ κοινοῦ, βοηθήσοντες, καὶ ξυναγορεύσοντες, καὶ παραμυθησόμενοι τὸν ἄνδρα (De morte peregrin. § 13. T. VIII. p. 280. Bipont.).



There was special reason, however, for the appearance of Trophimus. On occasion of Paul's first imprisonment, his presence was indispensable, as he had been the cause of Paul's apprehension (Acts 21: 29). According to the Roman laws, witnesses on both sides were examined personally to decide the cause, and in this case the main accusation depended on the question, whether Trophimus was a heathen, so that Paul was chargeable with having introduced heathen into the temple? Now, if he travelled in company with his countrymen, the delegates from Asia to the apostle, and fell sick on his journey, the passage signifies, very naturally : *Trophimus they left sick at Miletus*. Such an accident must have occasioned no little hindrance to Paul's trial and the decision of his cause.

We do not know that Trophimus had any thing to do with the second imprisonment ; but it is certain that he was bound to appear at the first trial. The supposed objection, therefore, in regard to him, in fact confirms what it was intended to disprove.

We are directed to the first imprisonment, likewise, by the agency in Paul's fortunes which is attributed to Alexander, who in the uproar at Ephesus was put forward by the Jews as speaker (Acts 19: 33), and who now persecuted the apostle with animosity before the Roman tribunal (2 Tim. 4: 14, 15). Those who were desirous of bringing Paul to trial would not base an accusation on any old, half-forgotten story ; they must have made use of the first occurrence which could serve their purpose, and have appeared when process was commenced against him. Besides, it was uncertain whether a second opportunity would ever occur. In the tumultuous times in which Paul's second imprisonment took place, witnesses and accusers would hardly have been summoned from remote provinces, or the trial prolonged for one or two years, so that all who wished to bring accusations could have had time to appear in Rome.

The second Epistle to Timothy, therefore, was composed during Paul's first imprisonment at Rome. It was written after the Epistle to the Ephesians, and before that to the Colossians. The apostle in this Epistle earnestly summons Timothy to his side. Now, when the Epistle to the Ephesians was sent, Timothy was not with him ; when those to the Colossians and Philemon were sent, he was. The Epistle to the Ephesians and the one to Timothy both went to Asia, and therefore may both have been sent at the same time.

In the Epistle to Timothy his situation is still gloomy and doubtful ; he has still the prospect of a tragical fate before him, and sees little probability of deliverance. In the Epistle to Philemon, however, which was sent at the same time with that to the Colossians, he expresses hopes of his liberation, and promises Philemon a visit.

### § 130.

The contents of the Epistle to Timothy are as follows : I often think of thee, and desire ardently to see thee ; be not ashamed of me, or of the Gospel, for which I am in bonds. Many have fallen away from me ; thou wilt not do so. Take courage ; teach with perseverance, as I have done ; I live and die for the sake of Christ, that I may reign with him

(—2: 14). Meddle not with disputes, or over-learned topics ; be every where a worthy, meek, and patient teacher (—3: 1). But be on your guard ; know that a pernicious class of false teachers will arise ; do thou, on this account, only cleave the closer to pure doctrine ; continue faithful to your early instruction ; watch, be careful, be unremittingly attentive, for Jesus' sake (—4: 6.) I am now ready to be offered ; hasten to me. All have left me, and cruel accusers have risen up against me ; but the Lord knows how to work out deliverance still.

### § 131.

#### OF THE HERETICS AGAINST WHOM THE EPISTLES TO THE EPHESIANS, COLOSSIANS AND TIMOTHY ARE AIMED.

Without an acquaintance with the opinions of those teachers who caused the apostle so much apprehension and sorrow, many parts of these writings must necessarily be obscure and unintelligible. An investigation of them is necessarily comprehended in an Introduction, the object of which is to furnish such historical and critical knowledge as is prerequisite to the business of interpretation.

From the traits by which the apostle characterizes them, some have thought that they were Gnostics, others that they were Essenes ; and each party derives arguments in behalf of its position, from accordance in tenets, opinions, and customs. But perhaps it would be as difficult to prove that the Gnostic system was completely developed at so early a period, as it is unjust to impute to the Essenes that extreme immorality, with which Paul charges these deceivers, inasmuch as the contemporaries of this Jewish sect, and all those acquainted with it, speak of it with respect, and extol its adherents as the most virtuous men of their time.

The resemblance which has been perceived in the tenets and sentiments of the two sects, compared with Paul's expressions, arises from a common source, the philosophy of the age, of which both partook. It will, therefore, be more accurate to go back one step, and consider the philosophy itself, as the common original of these systems. It found adherents among the Jews as well as Gentiles. Both retained their previous speculative opinions when they adopted Christianity, and endeavored to combine or reconcile them with it, as well as they were able. By this means Christianity became disfigured, and unlike itself, and would have been swallowed up in an ocean of philosophical vagaries, if the apostles had not also protected against human folly that which they defended with their blood and their lives against violence.

The Greeks were very early acquainted with the oriental, or, as it was called, Babylonish or Chaldee philosophy, as were the Romans, long before the time of Augustus, and still more familiarly during his reign ; and the system bid fair to spread over all Asia and Europe. It employed various divinities and subordinate spirits for the explanation of certain natural occurrences and for the regulation of earthly affairs in general, as well as for the solution of certain metaphysical questions, which have always been classed among the difficult problems of philos-

ophy. The practical part of this system consisted of precepts by the observance of which men might procure intercourse with these spirits or demons. The advantage promised from this intercourse with spiritual beings was, that by their aid superhuman knowledge could be acquired, future events foretold, and supernatural deeds performed.<sup>1</sup> These philosophers were well known under the name of Magi and Chaldeans, who, in order to adapt their system more perfectly to the western nations, altered it according to the Grecian philosophy, and finally succeeded, it seems, in combining it with that of Plato. Hence arose in later times the sect of the New Platonists, and the Gnostic sect among the Christians.

These men even made their way to the throne. Tiberius received instruction in their philosophy, and was fully convinced, that by communication with demons extraordinary things might be learned and effected.<sup>2</sup> Nero caused a great many of them to be brought from Asia, not unfrequently at the expense of the provinces. The supernatural spirits would never appear, but still he did not abandon his belief in them.<sup>3</sup>

The Magi and Chaldeans were consulted on occasion of great undertakings,<sup>4</sup> foretold the result of conspiracies, called up spirits, prepared sacrifices, and afforded the aid of their arts in love-affairs.<sup>5</sup> Even the severity of the laws, which were often directed against them in Rome, had no other effect than to increase their reputation.<sup>6</sup>

As they found access and favor with all classes in the capital, so did they likewise in the provinces. Paul found a Magian in the court of the Pro-consul at Paphos (Acts 13: 6). There was one at Samaria, named Simon, who was there regarded as a being of a higher and spiritual order (Acts 8: 9). The expression employed is remarkable, as being a scrap of the technical language of the Theurgists: the people called him a *ΔΥΝΑΜΙΣ τοῦ θεοῦ μεγάλη*. Pliny gives the same denomination to some of the demons and subordinate spirits by whose co-operation extraordinary results were effected. He calls them *POTESTATES*.<sup>7</sup>

Justin Martyr, the countryman of Simon, has preserved to us some of the technical expressions of his adherents. He says they gave him the exalted title: *ὑπεράνω πάσης ἀρχῆς, καὶ ἐξουσίας, καὶ δυνάμεως*.<sup>8</sup>

Of these classes of spirits, which appear under such different names, there were the superior, which ruled the others, and the inferior, which

1 Diod. Sic. L. II. c. 29, 30, 31. p. 142—144. Wessel.

2 Dio Cass. L. LVII. p. 419. Rob. Steph. Respecting his teacher Thrasyllus, see Juven. Sat. VI. 575. Tacit. Annal. L. VI. c. 20, 21. Gronov. Juv. Sat. X. 93. "Principis augusta Caprearum in rupe sedentis cum grege Chaldæo."

3 Plin. Hist. Nat. L. XXX. c. 5.

4 Tacit. Annal. L. II. c. 27 seq.

5 Philo, De legg. special. p. 542. Ed. Turneb.

6 Tacit. Ann. L. II. c. 32. Sueton. in Vitell. 14. Juvenal, Sat. VI. 556—560.

7 Plin. Hist. Nat. L. XXIX. c. 19. "Sanguinem (basilisci) Magi miris laudibus celebrant . . . . Tribuunt ei successus petitionum a *potestatibus* et a diis."

8 Dial. cum Tryph. Ed. Rob. Steph. p. 115.



were of a more material substance, and might therefore come into immediate contact with matter, and which executed the commands of their superiors.<sup>1</sup>

By communication with the superior spirits, a person might command the service and aid of the inferior; for the more powerful demons then ordered the lesser ones (*ἐν τῇ ἄρχοντι τῶν δαιμονίων*, Matth. 12: 24) to perform particular commissions in the material world.<sup>2</sup>

A complete exhibition of this system and its various forms has been furnished us by the Syrian philosopher, Jamblicus of Chalcis, in his work, *On the Mysteries of the Chaldeans and Egyptians*. I know, indeed, that the work has been by some regarded as not his;<sup>3</sup> but supposing it to be the production of any New Platonist, we have at all events this advantage from it, that in it are collected together, in a comparatively short compass, all those absurdities which we should otherwise be compelled to glean from many other writings. We will, therefore, deduce from it and present here a short sketch of this remarkable system, as it existed after it became current among the Greeks.

The following are its principal points. The nature of the gods is a pure, spiritual, and perfect unity. Considering this high and entire immateriality, no operation upon matter on their part is conceivable; and hence they could not create and cannot govern the world.<sup>4</sup>

It is therefore necessary to suppose certain subordinate deities, who are compound in their nature and can operate on gross matter. These are the creators and governors of the world, *δημιουργοί* and *κοσμοκράτορες*.<sup>5</sup>

The superior deities are, notwithstanding, the real cause of all that exists, and everything derives its being from their fulness, *πλήρωμα*.<sup>6</sup>

There is no abrupt descent from the highest to the lowest deities, but a continuous, gradual declination from the supreme pure spirit to those gross natures which are nearly allied to matter, and thus are qualified to operate upon it.<sup>7</sup> These spirits occupy various places of abode in the gross atmosphere or in more elevated regions, according to their grosser or purer nature.<sup>8</sup>

1 "Neque enim ipsos (deos) a curâ rerum humanarum, sed a contractatione solâ removi . . . Cæterum sunt quædam divinæ mediæ potestates (*δυνάμεις*) etc." (Apul. De Gen. Socrat. p. 229, Bipont.).

2 "Quæ cuncta cælestium voluntate et numine et auctoritate, sed dæmonum obsequio et ministerio fieri arbitrandum est" (Apul. l. c. p. 230).

3 Chr. Meiners, "Judicium de libro, qui de mysteriis . . . Jamblichio vindicari solet," in Comment. Soc. Reg. Goetting. 1781. Cl. Philol. p. 50. The passage, Schol. in Plat. in Anecd. Græc. Siebenkees, p. 21. Norimb. 1798, may be regarded as an additional evidence since discovered in favor of Jamblichus.

4 Jamblichi Chalcedensis ex Cælesyria de mysteriis liber. Ed. Thom. Gale Oxon. e theat. Sheld. 1678. Sect. I. c. 7. p. 9. VIII. c. 2. 158.

5 Sect. II. c. 3. p. 41. *Οἱ μὲν δοκοῦσιν οὗτοι εἶναι οἱ κοσμοκράτορες, οἱ τὰ ὑπο σελήνην στοιχεῖα διοικοῦντες* . . .

6 Sect. I. c. 8. p. 15. *Ἀλλ' οἱ μὲν κρείττονες ἐν αὐτῷ ὡς ὑπὸ μηδενὸς περιέχονται, καὶ περιέχονσι πάντα ἐν αὐτοῖς. Τὰ δ' ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς ἐν τοῖς πληρώμασι τῶν θεῶν ἔχοντα τὸ εἶναι κ. τ. λ.*

7 Sect. II. c. 3. p. 41. Sect. V. c. 19. p. 134—135.

8 Diog. Laert. in Proæm. p. 5. Henr. Steph. *Ἀσκεῖν (Χαλδαίους) τε καὶ μαν-*



The highest of these classes of spirits are called *ἀρχαί* or *ἀρχικά εἶδη*.<sup>1</sup> Other divine natures, *θείαι οὐσίαι*, are intermediate beings, *μέσαι*.<sup>2</sup> Those which direct the affairs of the world are called *ἄρχοντες*,<sup>3</sup> and the spirits which obey their orders *δυνάμεις* and *ἄγγελοι*.<sup>4</sup> The *ἀρχάγγελοι* are not generally recognized in this system; the class is said to have been of later origin, and to have been first introduced into the spiritual world by Porphyry. If we add further the *ἐξουσίαι* of which, as we have seen, Justin speaks, we shall have enumerated most of the technical names employed in this demonology.<sup>5</sup>

Now, to attain a union with the superior orders of spirits, in which alone man's perfect felicity consists, it is first necessary that one should be freed from servitude to the body, which detains the soul from soaring upward to the purely spiritual.<sup>6</sup>

Matrimony, therefore, and every indulgence of the sexual passion, must be renounced, before this perfection of felicity can be attained. Indeed, the magian offerings and ceremonies cannot, without great injury, even be imparted to those who have not emancipated themselves from corporeal lusts and attachments.<sup>7</sup>

To eat meat, or to eat of any slain animal at all, nay, even to touch it, is contamination.<sup>8</sup>

Bodily exercise and purifications, although the gift of prophecy is not communicated by them, do yet assist it.<sup>9</sup>

Notwithstanding the gods listen only to the holy, they still mislead men to the commission of unholy actions.<sup>10</sup> This is probably because

τικὴν, καὶ πρόδροσιν καὶ αὐτοῖς θεοὺς ἐμφανίζονται λέγονται. Ἀλλὰ καὶ εἰδώλων πλήρη εἶναι τὸν ἄέρα κατ' ἀπόρροϊαν ὑπὸ ἀναθυμιάσεως εἰσχυρισμένον ταῖς ὕψει τῶν ὀξυτερῶν (Apul. De Gen. Socrat. p. 229—232). "Cæterum sunt quædam divinæ mediæ potestates inter summum æthera et infimas terras, in isto intersitæ aeris spatio, per quas et desideria et merita nostra ad deos commeant . . . Habebant igitur hæc dæmonum corpora modicum levitatis, ne ad inferna præcipitentur." Although Jamblichus differs from the opinion of those who assign the abodes of the various orders of spirits according to the degree of their materiality: *Τὴν πρὸς τὰ διαφέροντα σύμματα κατὰ τάξιν, οἷον θεῶν μὲν πρὸς τὰ αἰθέρια, δαιμόνων δὲ πρὸς τὰ ἀέρια, ψυχῶν δὲ τῶν πρὸς τὴν γῆν αἰτίαν εἶναι* (Sect. I. c. 8), he still mentions *οὔτε ἀέριοι καὶ οἱ περὶ γῆν δαίμονες* (Sect. VI. c. 6).

1 Jambl. Sect. I. c. 7. p. 11.

2 Sect. I. c. 6.

3 Sect. II. c. 7. p. 49.

4 Sect. V. c. 21. p. 136.

5 The doctrine of the Logos in this system was drawn from the Egyptian philosophy. *Τότε τῷ ὅλῳ δημιουργῷ τὴν ψυχὴν προσάγει καὶ παρακατατίθεται. Καὶ ἐκτὸς πάσης ὕλης αὐτὴν ποιεῖ μόνῳ τῷ αἰδίῳ λόγῳ συνεννομένην. Οἷον ὃ λέγοι τῇ αὐτογόνῳ καὶ αὐτοκινήτῳ, καὶ τῇ ἀνεχοίῳ πάντα, καὶ τῇ νοεῷ καὶ τῇ διακοσμητικῇ τῶν ὅλων (scilicet οὐσίᾳ) . . . συνάπτει . . . Καὶ τοῦτο τέλος ἐστὶ τῆς παρ' Αἰγυπτίους ἱερατικῆς ἀναγωγῆς* (Sect X. c. 6).

6 Sect. V. c. 18. p. 133.

7 Sect. V. c. 18. p. 133.

8 *Διότι τὸ μὴ ζῶν ζῶντι, ὥσπερ τῷ καθαρῷ τὸ ὑπαρὸν . . . μολυσμὸν τινα ἐντίθουσι.* Sect. VI. c. 2. p. 145. Comp. c. 1. p. 144.

9 Sect. III. c. 13. and c. 11.

{ 10 Sect. IV. c. 11. p. 114. c. 12. p. 114, 115.

they have totally different ideas of what is good and just from those of mankind.<sup>1</sup>

§ 132.

This philosophy, the elements of which had long existed in the east, was moulded, in its progress to the west, into a system which met there with incomparably more approbation and celebrity than it deserved. To come nearer to the purpose of our investigation, it was particularly well received in those countries to which the apostle's letters were directed. Long after its first introduction, when Paul had converted the Ephesians, a large number of magian and theurgic books were brought by their owners and burned in Paul's sight (Acts 19: 19). At an earlier period, too, this city was celebrated in this respect; and the *Ἐφέσια ἀλεξίφάρμακα* and *Ἐφέσια γράμματα* are represented by ancient writers as famous means of procuring power over demons.<sup>2</sup>

There exists to this day among the ruins of Miletus a public document, viz. an inscription on one of the gates of the city, which testifies how firm in these regions was the belief in theurgic notions.<sup>3</sup> I will venture to cite a portion of it as evidence on this point :

ΙΗΘΥΩΑ  
ΟΥΩ  
ΑΕΗΙ  
ΑΓΙΕ  
ΦΥΛΑΞΟΝ  
ΤΗΝ ΠΟΛΙΝ  
ΜΙΛΗCΙΩΝ  
ΚΑΙ ΠΑΝΤΑC  
ΤΟΥC ΚΑΤΟΙ  
ΚΟΥΝΤΑC  
ΑΡΧΑΓΓΕΛΩΙ ΦΥΛΑCCEΤΑΙ  
Η ΠΟΛΙC ΜΙΛΗCΙΩΝ  
ΚΑΙ ΠΑΝΤΕC ΟΙ ΚΑΤ. . . .

The Synod of Laodicea was obliged, so late as the 4th century, to issue several edicts against the worship of angels, against magic and incantations. So deeply rooted were these opinions, that several centuries could not extirpate the remembrance of them.

<sup>1</sup> Sect. IV. c. 4. p. 108.

<sup>2</sup> Menandri et Philemonis reliquiae. Ed. Grot. et J. Clerici. p. 140. Erasm. Adag. Chil. Cent. 8. num. 49. Plutarch. Sympos. Quæst. L. VII. Quæst. 5. *Οἱ μάγοι τοὺς δαμονιζομένους κελεύουσι τὰ Ἐφέσια γράμματα πρὸς αὐτοὺς καταλέγειν καὶ ὀνομάζειν.*

<sup>3</sup> Voyage d'Italie, de Dalmatie, de Grece, et du Levante, par Spon. Part I. p. 423. Amst. 1679.

## § 133.

Now this theory is strikingly characterized by the expressions of the apostle.

He calls the system of his opponents a *philosophy*, which cannot be reconciled with Christianity: φιλοσοφία οὐ κατὰ Χριστόν (Col. 2: 8), an angel-worship, θρησκεία τῶν ἀγγέλων (Col. 2: 18), a demonology, διδασκαλίας δαιμόνων (1 Tim. 4: 1).

Further, he terms it *γοητεία* (2 Tim. 3: 13), which is the peculiar expression used by the ancients to designate magical arts and enchantments. Γόης, according to Hesychius, is μάγος, κόλαξ, περιεργος, and γοητεύει is ἀπατᾷ, μαγεύει, φαρμακεύει, ἐξαίδει, κ. τ. λ.

Paul compares these teachers with Jannes and Jambres (2 Tim. 3: 8). These, as we have before seen, were, according to ancient tradition, the enchanters, who withstood Moses by their arts.<sup>1</sup> Their names were so celebrated in the science of magic, that they were not unknown to the New Platonists themselves.

The apostle, in exhorting the Ephesians to equip themselves with the armour of faith, and to fight manfully, tells them (6: 12 seq.) that this is the more necessary, as their warfare is not against human power, οὐ πρὸς αἷμα καὶ σάρκα, but against spiritual beings. In enumerating these, he names in order the magian classes of spirits, ἀρχάς, ἐξουσίας, and particularly the κοσμοκράτορες, and likewise places their abode in the upper region of the air, εἰς τὸν ἀέρα, ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις.

Moreover, in the Epistle to the Colossians, in order to give them a high and reverential idea of Christianity, and to magnify the glory of Jesus, he says, that all existences, not even the spiritual world excepted, were created by him and are subject to him. He then selects the magian appellations, for the purpose of showing that the supposed demonocracy was entirely subject to his authority, whether θρόνοι, or κυριότητες, or ἀρχαί, or ἐξουσίαι etc. (Col. 1: 16). He also uses a term peculiar to the theurgic system, viz. πλήρωμα, to denote the original cause of all material and spiritual existence, from which, as the highest conceivable cause, all intermediate causes have proceeded, declaring that the origin of all things is to be referred to Jesus, and that the πλήρωμα dwells in him: ὅτι ἐν αὐτῷ εὐδόκησε πᾶν τὸ πλήρωμα κατοικῆσαι (1: 19. 2: 9. Eph. 1: 23).

At last, in order completely to demolish the whole system, he declares that Christ, by the work of redemption, had conquered the whole spiritual world, that he had dragged the ἀρχάς and ἐξουσίας in triumph as vanquished, and that their dominion and authority were at an end (Col. 2: 15).

What he says, too, of the seared conscience of the false teachers to

<sup>1</sup> Targum Jonathan, Exodus 1: 15. 7: 11. Plin. Hist. Nat. L. XXX. c. 2. p. 48. Vol. V. Bipont.—Apul. Orat. de Magia, T. I. Bipont. p. 94. "Ego sum ille Moses, vel Jannes, etc." It may hence be seen that the emendation in the last edition of Pliny: "A Mose etiamnum et Jotape," is not correct. Comp. Greg. Abulpharagius, Dynast. I. p. 26. Pharaoh's daughter gave Moses الي  
يانيس وييمريس الحكيمين to be instructed by them.

whom he refers, of their frauds, their avarice etc., is certainly more applicable to those men who taught and practised magical arts than any others. No class of men in all antiquity are more generally charged with such characteristics than these pretended confidants of the mystic powers.

Paul's strenuous opposition to a distinction of meats and to abstinence from wedlock evidently had reference to them, and his censure of bodily exercises arose from their recommendation of them, and their requisition of baths, lustrations, continence, and long preparation, as the sole conditions on which it was possible to obtain communication with spirits.

It was these, then, that the apostle had in his mind; who, when they adopted Christianity, formed that sect of the professed followers of Jesus which assumed the name of Gnostics, and which history accuses of having been, under all the various modifications of one and the same system, invariably addicted to magic arts. Other adherents to this system, among the heathen, formed the sect of the New Platonists, to the number of whom belong the Syrian philosophers, as well as some of the Egyptian, such as Plotinus and his disciples.

### § 134.

#### REMARKS ON RECENT ATTACKS UPON THE TWO EPISTLES TO TIMOTHY AND THE EPISTLE TO TITUS.

We have considered above (§ 113) certain charges brought against the 1st Epistle to Timothy. Soon after these were made, there appeared an opponent, not only of the 1st Epistle to Timothy, but also of the 2d, together with the one to Titus, i. e. of all the three pastoral letters, as he calls them. He brings charges against them before the tribunal of criticism, which he supports partly by reasons deduced from their language and peculiar style, and partly by historical difficulties in relation to them.<sup>1</sup>

He noticed that certain expressions occurred only in these Epistles, and were not to be found in any other of Paul's writings. As to the mere *ἅπαξ λεγόμενα*, e. g. in 1 Tim. 1: 5, *τέλος τῆς παραγγελίας*, and 2: 10, *ἐπαγγελλόμεναι θεοσεβειαν* etc., it cannot be expected that I should take any notice of these; for there is not one Epistle of Paul which has not, as is very natural, many such.<sup>2</sup> On the other hand, however, any peculiar phraseology in regard to the false teachers and their tenets, which is common to all the three Epistles, deserves more attention. Their doctrines are called *μύθοι* and *χρᾶνδεις μύθοι* (1 Tim. 1: 4. 4: 7. 2 Tim. 4: 4. Tit. 1: 14); to which let us add the

<sup>1</sup> Eichhorn's *Einleit.* in das N. T. III d Bd. 1st Hälfte. § 246 seq.

<sup>2</sup> Henry Planck, in his "Bemerkungen über den ersten Paulinischen Brief an den Timotheus" (p. 51, 52), reckons 54 *ἅπαξ λεγόμενα* in the Epistle to the Philippians, 57 in that to the Galatians, and 45 in those to the Ephesians and Colossians; in the 1st to Timothy he reckons 81; in the 2d, 63; in that to Titus, 44.



still stronger denomination *βεβήλους κενοφωνίας* (1 Tim. 6: 20. 2 Tim. 2: 16). On the other hand, correct doctrine is *διδασκαλία ὑγιαίνουσα* (1 Tim. 1: 10. 2 Tim. 4: 3. Tit. 1: 9. 2: 1), *λόγος ὑγιής* and *λόγοι ὑγιαίνοντες* (Tit. 2: 8. 1 Tim. 6: 3. 2 Tim. 1: 13). Religion is *εὐσέβεια* (1 Tim. 6: 3. 2 Tim. 3: 5. Tit. 1: 1 etc.). In two of these Epistles *γενεαλογίαι* (Tit. 3: 9), and *γενεαλογίαι ἀπεράντοι* (1 Tim. 1: 4), are censured.

In his writings generally, Paul has not spoken expressly of the false teachers; but, as e. g. in the Epistles to the Ephesians and Colossians, he merely alludes to their opinions, and casts them into shade by the side of the principles of Christianity. Whether it arose from the forbearance, which he wished should be exercised towards them in public (2 Tim. 2: 25 seq.), or from his reluctance to interrupt the solemn tone of these Epistles by any digressions, or from both these feelings together, certain it is, that only in the Epistles to his friends and assistants in the ministry, particularly in those to Timothy (1 Tim. 4: 1—9. 6: 3—6. 2 Tim. 2: 16—19, 23. 3: 1—10. 4: 3—5), has he described this mischievous class of men. Some of them he even mentions by name in these Epistles; and he makes evident allusion to them in the Epistle to Titus (1: 10—12. 14—16. 3: 9—12). Now, in doing this, he has made use of language for which there was no occasion when he was not speaking of these things, or was speaking of them in a different way, language which, employed in confidence, treats the subject in its real light: *μύθους, γραϊδίους μύθους, βεβήλους κενοφωνίας*. He likewise employs very appropriate contrasts, representing the condition of those led astray to be a *mental malady*, *νοσῶν περὶ ζητήσεις* (1 Tim. 6: 4), comparing the false doctrines to a *γαγγραινα* (2 Tim. 2: 17), and naturally terming the opposite, *healthful doctrine, healthful instruction, λόγος ὑγιής, διδασκαλία ὑγιαίνουσα*.

Among these mental aberrations, he reckons the *γενεαλογίας*, with which in one instance he connects the epithet *ἀπεράντους*. These cannot be properly interpreted as referring to the Jewish custom of preserving their lineage. They were rather a part of the *φιλοσοφία οὐ κατὰ Χριστόν* (Col. 2: 8), the *θρησκεία τῶν ἀγγέλων*, (Col. 2: 18), *διδασκαλίας δαιμονίων* (1 Tim. 4: 1); i. e. of the philosophical system of the time, which for certain purposes inculcated a gradation among spirits and their derivation from each other.

In this philosophical system, the whole of religious worship, including all the various species of *θρησκεία*, was called *εὐσέβεια*.<sup>1</sup> On this ac-

<sup>1</sup> Jamblich. De Myst. Sect. V. c. 21. p. 136.—*Οὐκ ἐκ μερῶν χρη, οὐδὲ ἀτελῶς συνφαίνειν τοῖς θεοῖς τὴν ἐπιβάλλουσαν εὐσέβειαν*.—Sect. V. c. 18. p. 133. *Ἐν δὲ τοῖς ἄλλοις τοῖς εὐσέβειας μυρίοις, καὶ δὴ ἐν τῷ θρηπολικῷ μέρει κ. τ. λ.* It is to be observed, likewise, that in the religious language of the time *εὐσεβής* was equivalent to *σεβόμενος* (Acts 10: 2. 7). Hence *εὐσέβεια* was sometimes used to denote Jewish piety. Thus it occurs in Josephus Antiq. cap. 2. n. 5. *καρπὸς εὐσεβείας*; and in Ant. L. cit. c. 2. n. 4, *τὸν θεὸν εὐσεβεῖν* is to adopt the Jewish religion, and c. 4. n. 1. *ἡ πρὸς θεὸν εὐσέβεια* is the adoption of Judaism. To recommend this was not the apostle's object; and hence, in Epistles to whole churches, where he had to guard against misunderstanding or misinterpretation on the part of a promiscuous collection of persons, he had reason to avoid this expression.

count Paul, in the Epistle under discussion, is earnest against the *εὐσέβεια* of these men (2 Tim. 3: 5. 1 Tim. 6: 5. 2 Tim. 3: 12, 13), and contrasts with their opinions the exalted doctrine of genuine *εὐσέβεια* (1 Tim. 3: 16, and 6: 3), retaining the word but correcting and refining the idea.

Thus we need no longer be surprised that these expressions do not likewise occur in other writings of the apostle, in which he is speaking of totally different things, or in which he alludes to the same errors and errorists, but speaks of them in a different way. It is only in the Epistles to his friends, and particularly in those to Timothy, that he has entered into a minute description of these men and their errors, for the purpose of inciting his younger assistants to caution and watchfulness.

In a similar way we may explain why in the Epistles to Timothy the apostle calls himself *κῆρυξ καὶ ἀπόστολος*, and *διδάσκαλος ἐθνῶν* (1 Tim. 2: 7. 2 Tim. 1: 11). On the subject of his appointment as apostle of the Gentiles, he has expressed himself fully in but two of his Epistles to entire churches, viz. those to the Romans and Galatians. For, in the capacity of teacher he was bound to observe uniformity in his conduct towards all believers, and not to exhibit a preference for either of the two branches of the Christian school; nor was he to concede to either a prior claim to his services, so long as he could avoid it. In the Epistle to the Romans, in which he defends the cause of the heathen against Jewish presumption and arrogance, he avows himself (11: 13) *in part*, *ἐφ' ὅσον εἰμὶ ἐγὼ ἐθνῶν ἀπόστολος*, apostle of the Gentiles, without forsaking the Jews or at all resigning his interest in their welfare; and in the 15th chapter he gives his labors in behalf of the heathen the aspect of a fulfilment of ancient promises, and justifies them further by the cooperation of Jesus Christ, by means of which he labored successfully to subject the Gentiles to the Messiah. In the Epistle to the Galatians, in which he opposes the commixture of Judaism with the doctrines of Christianity, he maintains his apostolic authority against such as ranked him, in respect to divine illumination, below the apostles at Jerusalem, by stating the fact that these apostles themselves had acknowledged his high vocation and authority to convert the heathen, and had accounted him their equal (2: 6—10). He permits the fact to speak for itself, without drawing any inferences from it in favor of his office as apostle to the Gentiles, because the subject which he was treating did not require any such enlargement. Thus much has he said to entire churches on the subject of his relation to the heathen. It is plain that, in these cases, he speaks not hastily, but with self-restraint and circumspection, that he might not mortify the believers converted from Judaism, by declaring the Gentiles to have been the principal, and themselves only a secondary and subordinate object of his mission. In the Epistles to Timothy he had nothing of this kind to apprehend, and to a man from whom he had nothing to conceal on the subject he could express himself definitely and without circumlocution respecting the chief purpose of his ministry and direction of his efforts: *I am an ambassador to the Gentiles, their apostle and teacher.*

Another source of objection is the asseveration *πιστὸς ὁ λόγος*. This occurs three times in the first Epistle to Timothy, again in the second, and also in that to Titus (1 Tim. 1: 15. 3: 1. 4: 9. 2 Tim. 2: 11. Tit. 3:

8), but is not found in any other Epistle of Paul. Let us see what is the case in his other Epistles. In these, instead of the words πιστός ὁ λόγος, he employs as asseverations the expression πιστός ὁ θεός (2 Cor. 1: 18), *μάστιγός μου ἐστὶν ὁ θεός* (Rom. 1: 9. Philipp. 1: 8), *ὕμεις μάστιγες καὶ ὁ θεός* (1 Thess. 2: 10). Also, *ἀλήθειαν λέγω, ἐν Χριστῷ οὐ ψεύδομαι* (Rom. 9: 1, which is repeated in 1 Tim. 2: 7). One still more solemn is, *ἐγὼ δὲ μάστιγα τὸν θεὸν ἐπικαλοῦμαι ἐπὶ τὴν ἑμὴν ψυχὴν* (2 Cor. 1: 23). He even uses one in the form of prayer, and with a doxology: *ὁ θεός καὶ πατὴρ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ οἶδεν, ὁ ὢν εὐλογητός εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας, ὅτι οὐ ψεύδομαι* (2 Cor. 11: 31). These expressions are indeed very different from the one first mentioned; but it is obvious to remark here also, that the cases were different in respect to the different Epistles. We know that these latter asseverations were addressed to a large number of persons of dissimilar dispositions, to whole churches and congregations, in writing to whom he appeals for confirmation to God and Christ. On the contrary, the affirmations in the other cases were not intended to be awfully solemn; they were addressed only to friends, and their whole emphasis is comprised in the words πιστός ὁ λόγος, which were sufficient for friends who were acquainted with the apostle's sentiments and the import of the words.

As to the general phraseology of these Epistles, their distinguished opponent himself admits that "they have much of Paul's manner in their language," and shows this by several examples. He likewise perceived the resemblance which their principles and reasonings bear to those of Paul.<sup>1</sup>

But, he continues, has their language entirely the same characteristics as that of the apostle's Epistles which are acknowledged to be genuine? Has it not more ease and perspicuity? etc. A very singular objection! Is not this always the case? Are not ease and perspicuity special characteristics of letters to friends, while compositions intended for a larger circle, and writings on matters of business, in regard to the impression and effect of which we are anxious and apprehensive, bear marks of the state of mind in which they were composed? It is an unreasonable course, to take writings of the latter description as a standard by which to measure Epistles to friends, and because these do not agree with the standard in all respects, to reject them; as though the priest's mantle and his private dress must be of the same fashion. The assertion which is afterwards made by the opponent of these three Epistles, that the other writings of Paul are far more unstudied and careless than these, and were, apparently, rather hasty than elaborate compositions, is, when stated thus generally, absolutely false.

The question, How it happened that Marcion did not insert these three Epistles in his *ἀποστολικόν*? was probably intended as an argument of an external character. If we consider their contents, we shall be set at rest on this point. In them, and in them alone, we find unsparing denunciation of the heretical systems which were springing up in Asia by the side of Christianity, and a description of the character of

<sup>1</sup> Eichhorn's Einleit. in das N. T. III. Bd. 1st Hälfte. § 247 seq. p. 317, 19.



their authors, by no means flattered in any of its features. Such descriptions afforded occasion for comparisons, materials for parallels, which it was most agreeable to avoid. On this account it did not seem advisable to Marcion to take pains himself for the preservation of such documents, or to admit their authority by receiving them into his apostolical Codex.

### § 135.

The objections of this learned man which have been hitherto enumerated are general, and applicable to all the three Epistles alike. He now proceeds, however, to present historical difficulties which respect each of them separately, and which, in his opinion, prove it to be *impossible* that Paul should have written them. As I have assigned to the Epistle to Titus the first place in the order of time, I will give it the same in the present discussion.

The various opinions in regard to the voyage of the apostle to Crete, which occasioned the Epistle to Titus, may be estimated as is thought fit; I am responsible only for my own. But I can hardly recognize them under the distortion which they have undergone.<sup>1</sup> I am in perplexity; I believe that I expressed myself with perspicuity, and reluctantly repeat what I have already said. Paul determined, after his first European journey, to visit Palestine. He embarked at Corinth, and landed at Ephesus (18: 18, 19). There were two different ways, I supposed, in which he might have arrived at Crete; either from having embarked in a vessel which, for reasons connected with its freight or other business, touched at Crete on its passage to Ephesus, or from having been driven thither by a storm. The first supposition I regarded as not improbable, inasmuch as Apollos, who sailed from Ephesus to Corinth (Acts 18: 24—19: 1), likewise touched at Crete, and was commended to the good offices of Titus there (Tit. 3: 13); whence it would seem to have been no uncommon route of intercourse between Corinth and Ephesus. I did not, however, reject the other possibility, from the fact that Paul, in the second Epistle to the Corinthians, refers to three shipwrecks of which no mention is made in the Acts, and which, notwithstanding, demand a place somewhere in the course of events. These are the two contingencies which I presented as accounting for the circuitous passage from Corinth to Ephesus by way of Crete. The first was left unnoticed; the second was assailed. Luke, it is said, does not appear to have known any thing of such a storm. But this whole portion of the history is passed over without detail; it is merely hinted at: ἐξέπλει εἰς τὴν Συρίαν—κατήντησε δὲ εἰς Ἐφεσον. What was the reason that Paul embarked for Syria and, instead of going thither, landed at Ephesus? A trifling difference, amounting to only thirty days' journey by land,<sup>2</sup> and ten, at least, by sea! Let an explanation be given how it happened that the apostle got so far out of his way, and then it may be said that there is no reason for supposing any storm. The other arguments by which I supported my opinion require no additional remark.

<sup>1</sup> Eichhorn, Einleit. in das N. T. III. Bd. 1st H. § 250. p. 376.

<sup>2</sup> The distance stated from Ephesus to Antioch, the capital of hither Syria, is literally authenticated. Philostorg. H. E. L. I. c. 3. Διευτόσης δὲ καὶ τῆς Ἐφέσου ἐκ τῆς Ἀντιόχου ὁδὸν ἡμέρων μάλιστα τριάνοντα.



The objections in relation to Nicopolis concern others; I have designated my Nicopolis, and no attempt is made to prove that my opinion in relation to it is not perfectly correct, admitting my general position.

### § 136.

Next in order comes the first Epistle to Timothy. We have before shown the relation which it sustained to historical events. Had the recent opponent of this Epistle paid suitable attention to our remarks, he would have had fewer objections to make. Instead of doing this, he has occupied himself particularly with the hypothesis of Mosheim,<sup>1</sup> which presents a fine opportunity for accumulating objections to one so disposed.

Passing over the historical difficulties which the learned opponent of the Epistle urges, not so much against the Epistle, as against the opinions of Mosheim and Benson, whose merits I honour, without, however, coinciding with their ideas on this subject, I feel myself called upon to reply to what he says of the view of the Ephesian church which lies at the basis of this Epistle, and the representation which it gives in regard to Timothy.

Is it credible, it is asked, that the church at Ephesus should have continued so long without teachers, and have been so completely ignorant respecting ecclesiastical arrangements, as the 1st Epistle to Timothy would lead us to suppose?

The apostle's first business was to communicate instruction; and until this had been done for some time he was not able to select from among the great number of believers those who were at once reputable in their lives and best qualified for the ministerial office. The appointment of teachers, therefore, was always one of his latest concerns (1 Tim. 5: 22). Another point, too, is to be considered. When the apostle was founding a church, he shared the office of teacher with no one; he stood alone as the divine deputy. In other business he had Titus and Timothy for his assistants. It was not till the apostolic work was concluded, and Paul left the place, that it was time to surrender the church to the charge of others; on which account he postponed doing so till Pentecost, the solemn day of the gift of the Holy Ghost, which he had designated as the limit of his stay at Ephesus. An uproar, however, drove him from the city at an earlier period; and hence nothing remained but to appoint Timothy over them, and to exhort them to respect him as his deputy.

Further; the Epistle does by no means represent the Ephesians to have been ignorant of ecclesiastical arrangements. They might easily have become acquainted with them at Colosse, Laodicea, and elsewhere. Paul even considered it superfluous to instruct them respecting the mode of electing their officers, the duties of the bishop, presbyter etc., or the respective limits of their official functions.

They might easily understand, moreover, that a quarrelsome person or a drunkard ought not to be made an elder of a church, which should be a pattern to the rest of the world in respect to purity of morals. But this is not the point to which Paul directs attention; he speaks of such

<sup>1</sup> Eichhorn, Einleit. in das N. T. III. Bd. 1. H. § 248. p. 333—338.

as were once of this character, but had now reformed and become members of the church. These, after their reformation, might be equally virtuous with others, and might perhaps excel them in capacity. Now, if such presented themselves as candidates for offices in the church, were their claims to be admitted, or not? This was the point to be decided. In the church, considered by itself, there might be little scruple as to their appointment; but, considering the reputation to be maintained by the church among those without, they ought not to be admitted as candidates. Among their heathen fellow-citizens they were more notorious for their vices than for their reformation, which was of a private and noiseless character. If such persons were known to be officers in the church, the reputation of the whole body of Christians was endangered. Most of the directions in this Epistle in regard to church-officers are, like these, not instructions as to their duties, but restrictive and preventive in regard to the claims of importunate persons.

The case is the same as to the *νεόφυτοι*, who might venture to present themselves as candidates for offices, while there were in the church older Christians, who had been more thoroughly tried in faith and doctrine. So too, in relation to the women who might claim to be enrolled among the widows and to share in the benefactions which they received (5: 9—17).

Then as to Timothy himself. He is, it is said, according to this Epistle, a novice in every thing; and what an inconsistency is here! A short time before, Paul described him in one of his Epistles to the Corinthians (1 Cor. 4: 17), as a man thoroughly acquainted with the Christian system, as he himself invariably inculcated it; while, on the other hand, in the 1st Epistle to Timothy the apostle is obliged to direct his attention to the first principles of doctrine, that he may know how to conduct (1 Tim. 3: 16). Let any man, who can, comprehend this, exclaims here the opponent of this Epistle.<sup>1</sup>

Still it is not so very difficult of comprehension. It is one thing to be thoroughly acquainted with a system in its whole extent, and to be able to answer questions and solve doubts in regard to it, and another to be able to select from the whole, according to the peculiar wants and circumstances of a particular place, those doctrines which need to be enforced there more earnestly than in other places. The latter was the point which the apostle had in view, viz. what was suitable to the local condition of Ephesus, and, with reference to this point, far from detaching his system as though he was writing to a learner, he merely furnishes one whom he knew to be well informed on the general subject a concise suggestion, which, to us, who are not so well informed, constitutes one of the difficult passages in the New Testament.

Consider for a moment the subjects of moral instruction which are enjoined upon him by Paul, with the words, *ταῦτα παράγγελλε* (1 Tim. 4: 11. 5: 7 seq. 6: 17). We cannot suppose that Paul imagined Timothy to be ignorant that it was not bodily exercise but godliness which was profitable to salvation, that the morality of a wanton widow was not on a very secure foundation, or that the silly pride of wealth was not becoming in a Christian church. The apostle, as every one must see,

<sup>1</sup> Eichhorn, Einleit. in das N. T. III. Bd. 1. H. § 248. p. 340.

merely takes notice of certain local vices, against which it was Timothy's duty to warn those under his care. Viewed in this light, other similar charges which have been made against this Epistle become null and void.

The opponent of this Epistle proceeds to contrast the representation of Timothy in 1 Thess. 3: 1, 2, and 1 Cor. 4: 17, viz. as well skilled in the business of his calling, with that in the 1st Epistle addressed to him by Paul, in which he appears to be a novice without any knowledge of affairs. Let us not be disturbed by the cases adduced. The fact that Paul sent him to the Thessalonians, with the charge of encouraging them to perseverance in the doctrines which they had been taught (1 Thess. 3: 1, 2), and that he likewise sent him to Corinth as his deputy, with the important commission to explain and solve, from his knowledge of the apostle's sentiments, such doubts as might still exist in regard to the subjects of the 1st Epistle to this church, does indeed prove that Timothy was a peculiarly trust-worthy agent; but neither of these commissions bore any comparison with that which was now entrusted to him. He had never before stood at the head of a numerous body of Christians, empowered to direct their ecclesiastical affairs, the appointments to the ministry, and to other offices in the church. Thus we have here the same Timothy, but another state of things. To be able and learned is a different affair from possessing that experience and knowledge of mankind adequate to the proper performance of duties in which a high degree of these qualities is requisite. To supply the want of these was the principal object of Timothy's more experienced instructor.

It is true that Timothy ranked as colleague of the apostle, and, what is more, was his friend and *ἰσόψυχος* (Phil. 2: 20); still he was not on that account the older or more experienced. It was six years after the time when Paul made Timothy his companion (Acts 16: 1 seq.) that the occurrence at Ephesus took place. When Paul associated him with himself, he was not yet an *ἀδελφός*, he was only a *μαθητής*, a Christian disciple. If we suppose him to have been at that time 20 years of age, he was yet a young man when the Epistle was written, and it was necessary that Paul should rouse and quicken his caution against being led astray by prejudice, *διὰ προκρίματος*, or beguiled by partiality, *πρόσκλησις* (1 Tim. 5: 21). It is easy to see that Paul endeavors to supply Timothy's want of knowledge of the world and of mankind—not any want of acquaintance with Christianity.

It was not the case when Paul sent Timothy to Thessalonica, nor when he sent him to Corinth, as it was when he left Ephesus, that circumstances prevented him from giving Timothy any preparation and instruction in respect to the subject of his commission. As to the kind or amount of instruction and advice which he gave him on the first two occasions we have no account, to enable us to judge concerning the contents of the Epistle which in this case he was compelled to substitute for oral instruction. In default of these, we may be guided in our judgment of this Epistle by the general truth, that the contents of any letter of instruction sent to Timothy at Ephesus by the apostle, the degree of particularity which it must exhibit, depended not solely upon the character of the man for whom it

was intended, but likewise upon the solicitude of him who wrote it. Thus, had we been able to form our estimate by the first standard, the latter would completely overthrow it. Even granting that Paul was unnecessarily particular in his directions to Timothy, the circumstance is but a confirmation of the old observation : "*Habet hoc sollicitudo, quod omnia necessaria putat.*"<sup>1</sup>

This anxiety about minute points thoroughly confutes the charge sometimes made against this Epistle, that it does not contain any of those particularities in which the apostle is so much wont to indulge. There are so many references to the vices of certain classes and individuals in the church, so many precautions and marks of anxiety, that our critic took umbrage at them, and drew from them the conclusion that Timothy was supposed and represented in this Epistle to be more deficient in experience and capacity than was really the case, and the church more ignorant, than they probably were. Might he not as properly have inferred, that the writer was intimately acquainted with this church, had clearly before his mind the character of each individual, and in particular, the erroneous feelings of some as respected the organization of the church, and, like a careful father of a family, when separated from it, was desirous of noticing in his letter every thing which concerned his household, and of providing against every apprehended impropriety?

Our opponent requires us to specify some allusions to occurrences in the life of Timothy, and we refer him to the following. 1 Tim. 1: 18. 4: 14. 5: 23. 6: 12. The objection that the apostle does not say a word of the progress of his journey and the state of his health, as is customary in writing to friends, might as well have been omitted. Such matters Paul was accustomed to leave to the bearers of his Epistles, who he took care should be trust-worthy men (Col. 4: 7. Eph. 6: 21, 22).

The fact that so many topics are referred to in the Epistle, and the careful attention given to particulars, though it has been attempted to turn these circumstances to its prejudice, rather vouch for its genuineness. Such must have been the nature of an Epistle written by Paul with reference to a church in the midst of which he had lived a long time; every member of which he had been acquainted with and had instructed and exhorted in public and in private, and had urged with tears to repentance and reformation (Acts 20: 20, 31); and which had only become the dearer to him from his labors and anxieties on its behalf. Compare it with the Epistle to Titus. The latter, it is true, contains beautiful passages, expressive of elevated feeling, but is, notwithstanding, in the main a business-letter, more general in its nature, written with a sentiment of contempt for the abandoned people among whom Titus was to commence the duties of his office. It seems to have originated merely from the dictates of duty, connected with half-extinguished hopes. On the other hand, the Epistle to Timothy is written with anxious attention to particulars, is indicative of solicitude and numerous trifling apprehensions, of sympathy and affection.

Sometimes, too, the apostle's condition gleams plainly through it. Expelled from Ephesus, and uncertain whether the unquiet state of things

<sup>1</sup> Plin. Epist. L. VI. Ep. 9.



at Corinth would permit him to appear in the midst of that church without insult, he sometimes cast his eyes back upon Ephesus with a hope that the commotion might have so far subsided, as to allow him to appear there again, through the favor and intervention of the principal men of the city (Acts 19: 31). At times he seems to count most on this possibility; at times to trust more to the Corinthians. Both these hopes are alluded to together in 1 Tim. 3: 14, 15; and in 4: 13 the first recurs again. It would seem as though, pressed on opposite sides by two misfortunes, he could not determine which was the greatest.

### § 137.

We will now direct our attention to the 2d Epistle to Timothy. I must here recur to the observation that there would not have been room for all the objections made against it, had my remarks, which were not, I think, entirely superficial, been properly regarded. I refer particularly to the objection respecting Trophimus and Erastus (2 Tim. 4: 20).<sup>1</sup>

The next difficulty relates to Aquila, whom the author of this Epistle salutes as though he were at Ephesus (2 Tim. 4: 19), while, not long before, Paul sent him a salutation as being resident at Rome (Rom. 16: 3). But the period of time between these two letters amounts to more than three years; and that one should change his place of residence once in three years is not to be reckoned as an impossibility which overthrows the genuineness of the Epistle. It is even possible that he possessed at that time a spacious house at Ephesus (1 Cor. 16: 19).

Another objection I must present in the very words of my learned opponent. Would the apostle, he says, in order to animate and confirm the fortitude of his friend, have mentioned merely the persecutions (2 Tim. 3: 11. Comp. Acts 13: 14—52. 14: 1—6) of which Timothy had not been an eye-witness, inasmuch as they occurred before his conversion? Would he have passed over in total silence the far more cruel ones to which he was subjected at Philippi, at Thessalonica, at Jerusalem, and which took place under Timothy's own eyes? etc.

In examining 2 Tim. 3: 11, we see that Paul commences an *enumeratio*: ἐν Ἀντιοχείᾳ, ἐν Ἰκονίῳ, ἐν Λύστροις. He does not pursue it, however, but passes to general phraseology, οἷους διωγμούς κ. τ. λ. The reason why he mentions Antioch, Iconium and Lystra, is plainly, that he meant to commence with his earliest journey among the Gentiles; and the reason why he does not pursue the *enumeratio* further is, that Timothy, having been an eye-witness, could pursue it himself. Conscious of this, Paul passes to general language, and dispenses with a long catalogue, which would have been superfluous to Timothy.

As to what this learned writer says in opposition to those who refer the composition of the Epistle to a second imprisonment at Rome, it does not bear against me, nor, in my opinion, against the Epistle.

Whoever maintains this Epistle to be an ideal composition, belies its character. It is evidently an effusion of high-wrought feeling on the part of one who had just passed through the severest storm in his life,

<sup>1</sup> Eichhorn, Einleit. in das N. T. III d Bd. 1. H. § 249. p. 358 seq.

and had breasted that storm without any assistance. All but Luke had previously consulted their own safety, and abandoned the apostle alone and unfriended to his fate. Even Titus had not evinced sufficient courage to venture anything in behalf of his master and friend. There was now, indeed, a momentary calm; but a second storm was certain, which it was to be feared would be as violent as the former. These afflictions and grounds of complaint against his friends, the apostle in a dignified manner refrains from noticing particularly, through the whole Epistle, until near its close, when he speaks of them briefly, with emotion, but yet with forbearance (4: 6 seq.)

From the beginning to the end of the Epistle, however, there is evinced a gloomy suppressed feeling of danger and of abused confidence; and the latter, not so much intentionally as on account of the predominant tone of his mind, is directed towards one who had never given occasion for it. Soon after the commencement of the Epistle, the apostle occupies himself with accumulating all the reasons for assurance in respect to the fidelity and constancy of his young friend; the example of his mother and grandmother, his consecration to the high office of the ministry, the former proofs of his disposition, the promises of Jesus Christ, and the rewards of a future state of existence. Among these he scatters instructions and exhortations, as though, uncertain whether he should ever again see him, he was desirous before his death to give him his last advice, as a son on whom his hopes rested, and whom he silently regarded as heir to his apostolic office.

The Epistle was evidently written with all those feelings which would naturally have arisen in the apostle's situation, and after what he had just experienced. All the parts of it coincide with his condition, and many passages, it cannot be denied, are instructive and spirited.

But what a contrast between this and the Epistle to the Ephesians, though they were written at no great distance of time from each other! In the one to the Ephesians, or, if we may thus denominate it, to the Asiatics and Phrygians, Paul speaks, if not without apprehension, yet with quiet composure, of his uncertain fate. True; but this difference might be the work of a few days. When he wrote the Epistle to Timothy, his first examination, in which he with difficulty escaped sentence of death on account of the violent attacks of his enemies, had evidently annihilated all his hopes (4: 14, 18); but when he wrote to the Ephesians, no fearful event of this kind had bowed his spirits. He first commends himself to their prayers, that he may fearlessly advocate the cause for which he was in bonds (Eph. 6: 18—21). The two compositions were separated by this intermediate event. In the Epistle to the Ephesians he shows himself ignorant of his danger; in that to Timothy we see that it has transcended his worst anticipations.

The Epistle to the Asiatics and Phrygians, therefore, bears the stamp of that undisturbed self-possession which he at first enjoyed in his confinement. In this situation, the youngest children of Christianity, churches of recent origin, which shortly before his imprisonment he had superintended, while resident in their vicinity at Ephesus, were uppermost in his mind. The remembrance of these rising churches filled him with joy and gratitude on account of the happy result of his mission, and on the other hand with apprehension on account of their

youthful standing, by which his mind was raised in his seclusion to that prayerful and solemn tone, which is so eminently apparent in this circular Epistle. Such was the effect of the difference in circumstances; in the one case we observe calmness, with pleasant recollections of the days of active life, and in the other a shuddering dread of a danger the extent of which was before unappreciated.

## § 138.

## THE EPISTLE TO THE PHILIPPIANS.

Philippi was the first European city in which Paul preached. It was situated east of the river Strymon, in that part of Macedonia which was formerly considered as belonging to Thrace. Its situation, and the thoroughfare from Asia to Europe which was in its vicinity, are described at length by Appian.<sup>1</sup> By Luke (Acts 16: 12) it is called a Roman colony, and the *πρώτη πόλις* of that part of Macedonia: and yet it was not so in point of rank, for Amphipolis took precedence of it;<sup>2</sup> nor as to its situation in respect to the voyage from Troas (Acts 16: 11), for the apostle came first to Neapolis. To solve this difficulty we must have recourse to numismatics. The denomination *πρώτη πόλις* frequently occurs on coins. Two or three cities in the same country or province assume this title at the same time; and from these coins it appears that it signified nothing more than the enjoyment of certain liberties and privileges, not by any means exclusive.<sup>3</sup>

That it was a Roman colony, is confirmed by Pliny;<sup>4</sup> and we learn from other sources that in this character it enjoyed distinguished privileges. The colony was founded or at least considerably enlarged, by Augustus himself.<sup>5</sup>

The apostle at first was very well received here, and met with ready credence; but he was accidentally imprisoned and harshly treated, until he declared himself a Roman citizen, when he was restored to liberty. He then went to Amphipolis (Acts 16: 12 seq.)

## § 139.

When Paul was afterwards a prisoner at Rome, the Philippian Christians, who must have become meanwhile a flourishing church, evinced that they were still grateful, and sent him assistance in his time of need (Phil. 4: 18). He wrote a letter to them, in which he expressed his thanks. This was probably the last Epistle which he composed in

<sup>1</sup> Appian, *De bell. civil.* L. IV. c. 105, 106.

<sup>2</sup> Livius, L. XLV. c. 19.

<sup>3</sup> Eckhel, *Doctrin. Vet. Numm. P. I. Vol. IV. c. 6. p. 282.*

<sup>4</sup> *Hist. Nat.* IV. 11.

<sup>5</sup> Digest. Leg. VIII. n. 8. "In provinciâ Macedoniâ Dyrracheni, Cassandrenses, Philippenses . . . juris Italici." Gfr. Walch, *Dissert. in acta Pauli Philippens.* Jenæ, 1726. Cellar. *Not. Orb. Ant.* T. I.

Rome; for he exhibits in it a clearer anticipation of deliverance than in any previous Epistle (1: 12, 14). He even intended to permit Timothy, his most confidential assistant, to visit them (2: 19), and in a short time, *ταχέως*, to come to them himself.

### § 140.

The contents of the Epistle are as follows: I thank God and rejoice concerning the increase of your knowledge and love. My fortunes have been so beneficial in their influence, that some have even been induced by them to preach the Gospel, not always indeed from pure motives, but still Christ is preached, at which I will rejoice (—1: 26). Let your conduct be worthy of the Gospel; live in unity; be disinterested, as was Christ, who humbled himself and took the form of a servant (—2: 17). If it be my lot to die, I will rejoice, but the prospect of my liberation is daily brightening (—2: 30). Have no confidence in circumcision; I have peculiar reason for confidence in it, but Christ is all to me; I long only for union with him. Follow my instruction, and listen not to false teachers (—4: 2). Continue steadfast in the Gospel and friends of every virtue. I rejoice that you cared for me; your beneficence has always been eminently conspicuous. I and all the brethren salute you.

### § 141.

#### THE EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS.

This Epistle, as its plan, the actual character of its different parts, and almost every passage, testify, was written for Jews, and moreover, for such Jews as were minutely acquainted with the ceremonies of religious worship at Jerusalem, the temple-service and things connected therewith. True, this acquaintance might be possessed by every learned Jew; but a promiscuous collection of people (such as the author of the Epistle certainly addressed) could not be supposed to possess it, unless they had opportunity to acquire it from actual and frequent observation.

Chrysostom, therefore, is correct in his general view, when he infers, simply from the knowledge previously requisite to understand the Epistle, that it was written to Jews in Palestine. All who admit that the original language of the Epistle was Hebrew adopt this opinion.

As clearly do such circumstances respecting the Christian church to which the Epistle was addressed, as are scattered through it, direct us to Palestine and Jerusalem. Some of its teachers and leaders had already distinguished themselves by an exemplary martyrdom in honor of the faith (13: 7). This had been the fate of two of the principal Christians in Jerusalem, viz. James and Stephen.

The readers of the Epistle had already endured many trials in behalf of the truth; some had been made, under torture and insult, a gazing-stock to the multitude. Many had been cast into prison, and had suffered the spoiling of their goods (10: 32, 34). Such persecu-



tion by the public authorities on account of religion had not yet been seen out of Palestine and its capital, anywhere in the Roman empire. The government did not deviate from its well-known universal toleration till the time of Nero's persecution.<sup>1</sup>

All this had already befallen them. Only one thing was wanting. They had not yet, as in the days of the Maccabees (Heb. 11: 34—39), defended their religion at the expense of blood and life (12: 4).<sup>2</sup> Matters had not yet arrived at such a pitch even in Palestine. No slaughters and massacres had yet occurred among the people. Hatred towards Christianity had as yet contented itself with a few victims, such as James and Stephen; not because the Sanhedrim wanted disposition to proceed further, but because it wanted the power under the Roman government.

Those to whom the Epistle was sent were strongly inclined to apostasy; for which reason the writer in many passages very forcibly represents the serious character of this step, the difficulty of retracing it after it had been taken, and the peril attendant on it (3: 7—4: 13. 6: 3, 4 seq. 10: 19—32, and 12: 25). The Jews were indeed always objects of complaint in many churches, for the vehemence with which they maintained the obligation of their institutions even upon Christians. But a ferment which could not be suppressed by any of the apostles, not even by James himself, and which avowedly looked forward to the refusal of obedience and the dissolution of the church as no very remote occurrences, such wild zeal for the law that no hesitation was felt to cut off thousands of believers from Christian communion for the most trifling reason, was exhibited in Palestine only at the close of the administration of Felix (Acts 21: 17, 23 seq.). The whole tenor and tendency of the Epistle were shaped by this condition of things.

### § 142.

The Jewish religion in Palestine was particularly alluring and seductive, on account of its external pomp and splendid ceremonies, which agreeably occupied the imagination and all the senses; while, on the contrary, the Christians, simple and noiseless in their assemblies, were only a body of retired and quiet friends to virtue, without high priest, altar, or sacrifices.

The Jewish feasts were so many days of universal festivity throughout the nation, on which men from all parts of the country met together, became acquainted with each other, and confirmed acquaintances already made. It was these which excited affection and fraternal feeling among the whole people, and kept up an unparalleled spirit of nationality. Many of these feasts, as commemorations of ancient national benefits, roused every sensibility in favor of Moses and the law; others were consolatory, like the feast of expiation, on which the high priest

<sup>1</sup> Gibbon, *Hist. Decline and Fall of the Rom. Emp.* Vol. I. chap. 2.

<sup>2</sup> It is not true that any slaughters or massacres had yet occurred among the populace; and yet this supposition is Eichhorn's principal argument that the Epistle could not have been written to Palestine (*Einleit. in das N. T.* III. Bd. 2d. H. § 266. p. 486).

appeared before God in the most holy place and made atonement for the sins of the whole people.

All this Christianity wanted, and among the inhabitants of Palestine the deficiency was a subject of reproach. Many minds, which were not prepared to worship in spirit and in truth, could not be satisfied or permanently controlled by such a system. When other circumstances were added, such as persecution and awakened patriotism, as was the case when the final rebellion was maturing, many readily resolved to give up a religion which did not seem to supply the place of that of their ancestors.

Objections of this nature, which local circumstances first occasioned and strengthened, the writer was obliged to obviate, and it was necessary that he should satisfy the Jews respecting them, in order to prevent their relapse. When they extolled above every thing else the preeminence of the law, which they received by angels and by Moses, the man of God, and objected to Christianity that it took its origin from a despised and suffering man; when they accused it of having no offerings, no high priest, and what was so important to sinful men, no sin-offering, and no feast of atonement, and of wanting every thing that made religion venerable and consolatory to the Jews; such important objections could not remain unanswered without injury to the cause of truth.

#### § 143.

The contents of the Epistle are as follows: He shows, on the contrary, the superiority of Christianity to the Mosaic law, from the dignity of its founder, who is even higher than the angels, to whom the Jews ascribed the giving of the law into the hands of the author of the Jewish constitution (—2: 12). Though he humbled himself and bore the sins of men, this was only that he might be a more merciful high priest (—3:). He then shows his preeminence above Moses, the mediator of the law, and solemnly warns them of the difficulty of returning, if they apostatize from Christ (—4: 14).

He then passes to the high-priesthood, and shows that Jesus was appointed to this dignity by God, and emphatically warns them not to venture the step of separation from him (—6: 20). He then shows the nature of the high-priesthood of Jesus; that he is not a priest of a Jewish order, but of the order of Melchisedeck, who in dignity excelled even their forefather Abraham,<sup>1</sup> and all his descendants, Aaron and the tribe of Levi; that Jesus was even superior to Melchisedeck, was a priest of the new covenant, of unequalled rank, who entered into the holiest of holies to atone for the people with blood, but not that of goats; that it was not necessary for him to do this every year, as it was for the Jewish High Priest; that he entered once only with his own blood, and by this offering had atoned for all men; that therefore no offerings were necessary in future, and a new order of things, a new dispen-

<sup>1</sup> Abraham is not, it is true, the principal subject here; but he was indispensable to the writer's purpose. According to the well-known saying of the Jews, the Messiah is certainly superior to Abraham, Moses, and the ministering angels: *וְרִיט מַאֲבְרָהָם נִשְׂא מִמֹּשֶׁה וְגַבְה מֵאַרְ מִמְּלָאכֵי שְׂרָת*.

sation, had arrived, that the ceremonies of the law were merely types of that which was actually exhibited in the new religion (—10: 19).

If, now, we have certain access to God through Jesus, our punishment will be the sorer if we cast him from us. To continue his adherents will indeed require courage, but faith will impart this. Faith is henceforth the way of justification and union with God; or rather it has always been so to all righteous and holy men, and ought to be to those whom he addresses; it should cheer them in their sufferings (—12: 12). They have come to a holier Jerusalem, and to the mediator of the new covenant; they have another altar of sacrifice, and another offering, viz. Jesus, who died without the city, as the sin-offering was formerly burned without the camp.

### § 144.

In what language was this Epistle originally written? Some of the Christian fathers assert that it was originally composed in Hebrew. Thus (e. g.) Clement of Alexandria. According to him Luke translated it into Greek, whence this Epistle and the Acts resemble each other very much in style and coloring.<sup>1</sup>

Origen, however, is not inclined to regard it as a translation, but explains its origin in another way. He thinks that the general thoughts were expressed by the apostle Paul, and arranged and clothed in their present phraseology by some one who listened to their oral delivery.<sup>2</sup> Such is his opinion, and about its validity he seems to have no doubt.

Thus a Hebrew original was not, to his knowledge, supported by history. This supposition had no more value in his eyes than his own hypothesis, which he at least considered to be as well-founded, if he did not give it the preference.

But he seems, it will be said, to adduce historical authority; for, in proposing the question, who was the author of this work as respected its written composition, he says expressly: ἡ δὲ εἰς ἡμᾶς φθάσασα ἱστορία, the *ἱστορία* that has come down to us decides in favor of Luke or Clement of Rome.

But *ἱστορία* here does not mean *history*; it has the general signification of *information, account*. His language is: "The Epistle is, according to the testimony of the ancients, to be ascribed to Paul; but who gave it its written form, God alone knows. The *ἱστορία* of some has come down to us, who say that Clement of Rome composed it, and of others who regard Luke as the one who committed it to writing." If some said one thing and some another, and God only knew the truth of the matter, the expression *ἱστορία* is certainly not to be taken in the sense of *history*. Besides, the *ἱστορία* did not relate to the question as to a Hebrew original or the contrary, but only to the question, to whom, in case Paul only furnished the ideas, which were written down by another, the merit of thus composing it was to be ascribed.

The intended statements of the ancients, therefore, were mere conjectures which were thrown out in order to explain the difference of style which it was thought was perceived between the Epistle to the

<sup>1</sup> Euseb. H. E. VI. 14.

<sup>2</sup> Euseb. H. E. VI. 25.

Hebrews and the other writings of the apostle; and as such they do not in the slightest degree limit our investigations.

From internal evidence the original cannot by any means have been Hebrew. In the second chapter, v. 6, 7, 8, the author cites from Ps. 8 the words: What is man?—and yet thou hast put all things in subjection under his feet, πάντα ὑπέταξας ὑπὸ τῶν ποδῶν αὐτοῦ. This word ὑπέταξας, thou hast subjected, is the foundation of many expressions in this connexion: v. 5. οὐ γὰρ τοῖς ἀγγέλοις ὑπέταξε τὴν οἰκουμένην; v. 8. ἐν γὰρ τῷ ὑποτάξει αὐτῷ τὰ πάντα, οὐδὲν ἀφῆκεν αὐτῷ ἀνυποτάκτον—ὁρῶμεν αὐτῷ τὰ πάντα ὑποτεταγμένα.

Now there is no word corresponding to ὑποτάσσειν in the Hebrew, the same idea being expressed by a circumlocution: *Thou didst put, or place, under his feet*, כָּל שִׂמְתָּ תַּחַת-רַגְלָיו. If then he wrote in Hebrew, and cited the text in Hebrew, the whole reference to the words of the text is lost; and the expressions derived from and referring to ὑποτάσσειν could not have been employed in Hebrew, on account of the frequent recurrence of the entire periphrasis. Would he have written in this way? "Thou didst put all things under his feet: but as to the angels he did not put all things under their feet: for, in that he put all things under his feet, he left nothing which he did not put under his feet: hence we see that all things are put under his feet."

In the 8th chapter he commences speaking of the promises of God in regard to a new covenant. He cites by way of argument Jer. 31: 31, 32 seq. where God promises a בְּרִית הַדְּשָׁה, a new covenant, different from that which he had established with the fathers of the Jewish nation, and then argues that a new covenant, בְּרִית הַדְּשָׁה, *καινή διαθήκη*, annuls the old. He proceeds in this train of thought in chap. 9, describing the ritual of the covenant and contrasting with it the priest and mediator of the new (v. 14, 15).

The nature of the subject assures us, that if the author wrote in Hebrew, he must have selected the technical word בְּרִית to designate the covenant with Abraham and the fathers. As, moreover, he quotes the words of Jeremiah, to which the chain of his discourse is linked and from which he makes deductions, he must so much the rather have retained בְּרִית, and must have been guided in his deductions by the prophet's phraseology. We must not be misled, therefore, by the conjecture that perhaps the author used the word בְּרִית.

Now though בְּרִית has the signification of *covenant*, we know that it has not a second sense which the author of the Epistle soon brings to view, viz. that of a *testament*; for which (he says) Christ died, because a testament becomes valid only through the death of the testator. If, however, he wrote in Greek, and originally cited the Greek version, he must have employed the word *διαθήκη*. This comprehends not only the first signification, but the second, viz. *testament*, and in fact contains good ground for the reasoning founded upon it, which could not have been based on the Hebrew.

In the 10th chap. 4, 5 seq., he proves that the ancient sacrifices have ceased forever. He appeals in support of this position to Ps. 40: 7, where a person, whom he represents as the Messiah entering the world, says to God: Thou desiredst not sacrifices, but a body hast thou prepar-



ed me—to do thy will. Hence, he continues, the ancient sacrifices are no more of any avail, and the *ποιῆσαι θέλημα*, 'the fulfilment of the will (of God) is enjoined instead (v. 9, 10). In conformity with this will, *ἐν ᾧ θελήματι*, Jesus once for all made an offering of his body, *τὴν προσφορὰν τοῦ σώματος*, for the universal remission of sins.

The argument turns on the passage: Thou desiredst not sacrifices, but gavest me a body, to execute thy will: *σῶμα κατηργίσσω μοι*. This will Jesus executed by the offering of his body, *διὰ τὴν προσφορὰν τοῦ σώματος*, and thus the passage has been fulfilled, and all other sacrifices cease. Formerly the offerings were frequent, *πολλάκις προσφέρων* (v. 11); now one offering, *μία θυσία, μία προσφορά*, is sufficient, and this is satisfactory forever, *εἰς τὸ διηνεκές* (v. 14).

The offering of the body, *προσφορὰ τοῦ σώματος*, and the offering once for all, *μία προσφορά*, have reference to the words of the Psalm, *σῶμα κατηργίσσω μοι*, thou gavest me a body. But the Hebrew text of the Psalm says nothing respecting a body; it merely says: Mine ears hast thou opened (bored) *אָזְנוֹתַי פָּרַתָּה לִי*. Thus, if the Epistle had been written in Hebrew, the deduction from the quotation as to the offering of a body, and all which is said further of the single offering that made every other superfluous, could have had no foundation. It was only the Greek text of the Psalter which could furnish him with the argument and render it valid.

Moreover, even the supposition that these words were spoken of the Messiah and referred to the very moment *when he entered the world*, *διὸ εἰσερχόμενος εἰς τὸν κόσμον λέγει* (v. 5), is likewise founded on the words: *thou hast prepared me a body*, aside from which there is no indication that this passage is to be understood of the Messiah's entrance into the world.

### § 145.

We have hardly done with one difficult question, before another still more difficult presents itself, viz. Who was the author of the Epistle? It is found in the collection of Paul's writings, but by what right does it take so honorable a place? If characteristic ideas and characteristic arrangement of them, or, in other words, a peculiar cast of thought, be any indication of the author of a production, this writing, in my opinion, is Paul's. The ideas which constitute the basis of the Epistle to the Hebrews all existed in Paul's mind, and were a constituent part of his general train of thought, from which they have passed into other productions of his pen. In these they are frequently found, in connexion with other ideas, but have not received so complete a development as in this Epistle, because they were not, as here, the subject of discussion, but were merely accessory ideas.

One of the principal points of view in which he considered the ceremonies of public worship, as well as the other institutions of the Jews, and which was the special ground of the course taken by the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews in making an application of all these institutions to Christ and his religion, is not barely discoverable in the Epistle to the Colossians, but is presented there in the same language in which it is expressed in the Epistle to the Hebrews. All these

things, Paul there says, are but the *σκιὰ τῶν μελλόντων* (Col. 2: 17), as in this Epistle, likewise, they are only the *σκιὰ τῶν μελλόντων ἀγαθῶν* (Heb. 10: 1. 8: 5), i. e. inefficient symbols of salvation and mercy, shadows of things, of which the religion that was to come was to contain the reality, the thing itself.<sup>1</sup>

Paul has sometimes given specimens of this mode of application, from which we may infer what would be his manner of treating the subject, and how perfectly the whole tenor of the Epistle to the Hebrews accords with his spirit.

In Rom. 3: 25, he represents our salvation through the death of Jesus by a figure drawn from the Jewish ceremonials, saying that God set him forth as the lid of the ark of the covenant (which on the feast of atonement was perfumed and sprinkled with the blood of the sacrifice) that he might blot out sins by his blood. It is true, however, that the word *ἱλαστήριον* may be translated *an offering of reconciliation*. In the Epistle to the Ephesians (5: 2), he represents the death of Jesus as a sacerdotal transaction, he having offered himself for us as a sweet smelling sacrifice, and being thus at once both priest and offering.

The typical interpretations in the Epistle, in which the tabernacle is represented as an emblem of the entrance of Jesus into the holy of holies in heaven (Heb. 8: 5, 6. 9: 24) will not seem singular when we perceive that in 1 Cor. 10: the passage through the Red Sea is considered

<sup>1</sup> The fact that Philo says something of the same kind: *τὰ μὲν ῥητὰ τῶν χρησμῶν σκιὰς τινὰς ὥσαντι σωμάτων εἶναι* (De Confus. Lingg.) is the principal reason given for the supposition which has been lately made, that the Epistle to the Hebrews is an Alexandrian production (Eichhorn, Einl. in das N. T. Bd. III. 2d Hälfte, § 259. p. 442). Just as if Paul did not take the same view in his Epistle to the Colossians: *ἃ εἰσι σκιὰ τῶν μελλόντων, τὸ δὲ σῶμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ* (2: 17). The second argument is, that the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews agrees with the Alexandrians in ascribing a secret and higher meaning to the accounts in relation to the ancient Jews. But it is not the case in this Epistle alone, as we see from 1 Cor. 10: 1—6 and 11, and from Rom. 5: 14, where Adam is represented as *τύπος τοῦ μέλλοντος*, with reference to the universality of the consequence of what he did (Comp. 1 Pet. 3: 20, 21). Thus the two views which have been mentioned are not exclusively Alexandrian; they are likewise Pauline, and we recognize in them that erudite manner and that cast of thinking, which were characteristic of the age, and which Paul adopted together with, and in opposition to, his contemporaries. What can be more like Philo than the *ἀλληγορούμενα* in Gal. 4: 21—31, compared with Philo "De Cherubim (init.), to which I have referred in Part 1st § 5, for the purpose of drawing from the spirit of the times in arguing from and treating of the sacred books, some general inference as to the period when the Pauline Epistles were composed. Lastly, the learned writer above mentioned likewise adduces particular expressions of analogous character in the writings of Philo and the Epistle to the Hebrews (p. 447). This similarity, however, is not confined to the Epistle to the Hebrews, but extends to all Paul's Epistles; as is not at all strange, considering that Philo and Paul were contemporaries. Lösner's extracts from Philo, it is well known, have reference to the whole N. Test. With reference to the Epistle to the Hebrews, Carpzov (in his Exercit. in Ep. ad Hebr.) as also, more recently, Schulz (Der Brief an die Hebräer, Breslau 1818. p. 265 seq.), the latter for the special purpose of supporting the opinion we are now combating, has extracted from Philo many passages relating mostly to Melchisedeck, Moses, the high-priesthood, the worship of the sanctuary, and the sacrifices. Wherever Paul had discussed these topics, the passages cited would have been of use in explaining his meaning. The similarity of subjects is the cause of the mutual resemblance between the two writers.

to have been a type of baptism etc., a τύπος, just as in the Epistle to the Hebrews the holy places are ἀντίτυπα τῶν ἀληθινῶν.

This principle and the interpretations founded on it are, in the earlier Epistles of the apostle, but indistinctly brought forward, rather intimated than detailed. We have sufficient evidence, however, that the views in which the Epistle to the Hebrews so richly abounds had already been formed in his mind, and would have been exhibited precisely thus, had his purpose led him to a more extended development of them.

When Paul represented the ancient ceremonial institutions as mere shadows, to none of which belonged any expiatory efficacy, he was bound to answer the question in what way forgiveness and the divine favor were to be obtained, and had been obtained by pious men of old, if the law was of no avail to that end. Had he not given satisfaction on this point, the representation which we have mentioned would have wanted stability. The solution of this question was essential to his position, for that could not be sustained without it.

The answer to this question is frequently presented by him, and is a peculiar one. He asserts that the divine favor never resulted from the religious observances of the Jews, but from faith, τῇ πίστει. With this word he connected a peculiar idea, such as no other of the apostles attached to it. Πίστις with him had reference to the ἐπαγγελία, to the divine annunciation of the measures devised for human salvation. It signifies confidence and unshaken hope that they will be carried into effect (Rom. 4: 16—18, 20. Gal. 3: 5 seq.).

This idea of the apostle is a fundamental one in the Epistle to the Hebrews, and constitutes a considerable part of its contents (see 10: 38—12: 4, and many other passages). It appears in the Epistle to the Hebrews precisely as the apostle has elsewhere stated, explained, and enforced it. In Rom. 8: 24—26 Paul characterizes faith, with considerable circumlocution, as hope, in contradistinction to that which is seen and felt, ἐλπίς βλεπομένη οὐκ ἐστὶν ἐλπίς—ὃ οὐ βλέπομεν, ἐλπίζομεν, etc. In the Epistle to the Hebrews this description is condensed in the form of a definition (11: 1), ἐλπίζομένων ὑποστάσις οὐ βλεπομένων.

Faith, according to Paul, gives us superiority over the adherents of every other religion, ἵνα καυχώμεθα ἐπ' ἐλπίδι (Rom. 5: 2). In the Epistle to the Hebrews, too (3: 6), it is the ground of a καύχημα, which he calls καύχημα τῆς ἐλπίδος.

It was this hopeful confidence, which both he and the author of this Epistle understood to be meant by the passage: The just shall live by faith (Gal. 3: 11. Heb. 10: 38). It was by this, according to both, that Abraham and Sarah, though past age, obtained a son (Rom. 4: 19. Gal. 3: 7. Heb. 11: 1). It was this πίστις, founded on the ἐπαγγελία, which made friends of God before the law, and became an example and means of grace for all under the law, etc.

Thus they coincide in their notion of faith, its reference to the ἐπαγγελία, its justifying efficacy, and in certain arguments and examples in confirmation of the declared inefficacy of the law and the deeds of the law, and differ in the following respects: that the Epistle to the Hebrews makes use of a multitude of examples, νέφος μαρτύρων; that in the Epistles to the Romans and Galatians πίστις is openly contrasted



with the law and the *ἐργοῖς νόμου*, while in the Epistle to the Hebrews the unpleasant contrast is not directly presented, but rather intimated; that in the other Epistles *πίστις εἰς Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν* is directly asserted to be the sole means of justification, while in this, without any express conclusion by the writer, it is left as a matter of inference for the reader.

Origen, therefore, was correct in asserting that *τὰ νοήματα μὲν Παύλου εἰσὶ*, for we find the views and sentiments of the apostle at the foundation of this Epistle; and not merely individual sentiments, but an entire class of them upon one subject.

In this Epistle, moreover, we meet with his figures and favorite expressions. We will only cite those examples which have reference to Christian instruction. With Paul God's word is a sword (Ephes. 6: 17). So in Heb. 4: 12. Instruction for beginners and weak-minded persons is milk; for those well-grounded in the faith, it is *βρωμα* and *σιερεὰ τροφή*, strong meat (Heb. 5: 13. 1 Cor. 3: 2). The first are *νήπιοι* (1 Cor. 3: 1. Heb. 5: 13); the subjects of instruction suitable for them are *στοιχεῖα* (Gal. 4: 9. Heb. 5: 12). The well-grounded, on the other hand, are *τέλειοι* (Heb. 5: 14. 1 Cor. 14: 20), and their condition is *τελειότης* (Col. 3: 14. Heb. 6: 1). Whoever will examine further the apostle's terminology on the subject of salvation, and the allegorical expressions and applications which he has used to illustrate it, will in these also recognize Paul.

Besides thoughts and figures, a great many of Paul's favorite words and phrases are to be found in this Epistle. Some of these have been collected by the industry of Wetstein,<sup>1</sup> and his collection has since been considerably augmented.<sup>2</sup>

### § 146.

On the other hand, passages have been selected from this Epistle which make against Paul's authorship, and two of them are vaunted as decisive.<sup>3</sup> The first, repeated for centuries, and frequently answered, sometimes more and sometimes less happily, is Heb. 2: 1—5. "Therefore we ought to give the more earnest heed to the things which we have heard,—how shall we escape if we neglect so great salvation? which at the first began to be spoken by the Lord, and was confirmed unto us by them that heard him, *ὑπὸ τῶν ἀκούσαντων εἰς ἡμᾶς ἐβεβαιώθη*, God also bearing them witness," etc. The author, it is said, here classes himself as one of those to whom that which the Lord taught had been communicated by his disciples. Now, so far from its being the case that Paul could use such language, he was even jealous of the imputation of dependence on the instructions of the apostles, flatly disowned it, and asserted that he received his teaching from God and Christ (Gal. 1: 11, 12 seq. 2: 6—15. 1 Cor. 15: 8, etc.).

But what are we to understand by the word *us*? Does it mean us

<sup>1</sup> Nov. Test. T. II. p. 386.

<sup>2</sup> Chr. Frid. Schmid, Hist. Antiq. et Vindic. Canonis. § 249. p. 662—665.

<sup>3</sup> Dav. Schulz, "Der Brief an die Hebräer," etc. Breslau, 1818. p. 125—130. The first objection had been already stated by Œcumenius; the "Scholia Græca" in Frid. Matth. N. T. contain a reply.



Hebrew Christians, or us, Paul only? It is clear that the writer is speaking of many persons, in regard to whom it was to be feared that they might fail in fidelity to the Christian system; and a sort of rhetorical figure is employed which is very common with the apostle. The writer includes himself in the number of those whom he addresses, speaks of their necessities and failings, as if he shared them, without meaning by this that he did so in every particular. Just so Paul, in Rom. 13: 11—14. (e. g.) says: "It is time for us (those converted from Paganism as well as from Judaism) to awake out of sleep, to cast off the works of darkness, to walk honestly, not in rioting and drunkenness, not in chambering and wantonness, not in strife and envying." If the apostle be here taken literally, what must we not charge him with, on account of the word *us*? Just as little did he mean to claim all the gifts which were distributed to different persons for the preservation and extension of the Christian church (Rom. 12: 6 seq.), although he makes use of the word *us*, meaning us Christians. Such figures of rhetoric will not allow a literal application to the writer.

It is attempted to obviate these considerations by a distinction. This mode of speech, it is said, may properly be used when *exhortations* and *warnings* are given, but not in historical statements. It is to be remembered that as *ἡμεῖς*, *us*, does not mean Paul only, but us who have this in common that we are Hebrew Christians, all valid objection against this mode of speaking is precluded. But does not the passage in fact contain an exhortation that they should guard against danger; for (the thought is) if the slighting of the institutions of the old covenant occasioned severe punishments, how shall we escape punishment, if we slight a far higher institution, which proceeded from the Lord, was confirmed (to us Hebrews) by his chosen disciples, and attested by miracles and the gifts of the Holy Ghost? Does not this passage belong to the class of warnings or exhortations? Though it does contain historical allusions, they are not themselves the subject of discussion, but are exhibited only in very general terms, in order to prove that the Jews would deserve punishment in case they should forsake Christianity. These are not presented for the purpose of narration, but as an *enumeratio*, which runs rapidly through a series of occurrences, without reference to their accompanying circumstances, or the particular concern of any individual in them.

Let us now turn our attention to the second passage. It has been regarded as inconsistent with the relation which Paul sustained to the Christians of Palestine, that he should say: "Pray for me, *ἵνα τάχιστα ἀποκατασταθῶ ὑμῖν*, that I may be restored to you the sooner" (13: 18). He had nothing to do, it is said, with the churches in Palestine.<sup>1</sup> It is true he was not connected with them as a teacher; but he was in another capacity. He had brought to them from Galatia, Macedonia, and Achaia, on the very occasion of his last visit to Jerusalem and his imprisonment there, charitable contributions which he had collected for them in the churches. They had, therefore, good reason to pray for their benefactor, that he might be restored to them again.

It is further objected, that the officers of the churches which are ad-

<sup>1</sup> Schulz, "Der Brief an die Hebräer" etc. p. 22 and 63.

dressed in this Epistle, are not called *πρεσβύτεροι* and *ἐπίσκοποι*, as officers in the church are termed in the Epistles of Paul, but *ἡγούμενοι* (13: 7, 17). But this was their proper appellation in Palestine, and confirms our position in regard to the destination of the Epistle. The churches of Palestine constituted an exception from the rest of the Christian churches in this respect, that their affairs were conducted, not only by presbyters, but by apostles themselves, as e. g. James and John, or by other men who took a distinguished part in the propagation of Christianity; and these were called in this country, by way of distinction, *ἡγούμενοι*, such as e. g. Barnabas and Silas Acts (15: 22).

The opponents of this Epistle thought they found support for their position in these passages; but they were troubled, on the other hand, by a friendly allusion to Timothy (13: 23), of such a nature that it seems particularly suitable to Paul, whose confidential assistant Timothy was, and to whom he was, in a manner, exclusively attached. They were therefore obliged, if possible, to prove that Timothy was not attached to Paul at this time, which they hoped to do by means of a pretended difference between the mode in which Paul speaks of Timothy in his writings and the mode in which he is spoken of in this Epistle. Paul always speaks of him in his Epistles, it is said, as *τίμον, γνήσιον τέκνον, συνεργός*, with commendation and affection, while the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews mentions him only in a cursory way: "Ye know our brother Timothy, who is set at liberty; with whom, as soon as he comes, I will see you."<sup>1</sup> As to the words: Ye know our brother Timothy etc., I certainly do not believe that Paul would have written so to the churches of Asia Minor and Europe, which Timothy had visited with him in the foundation of which he had coöperated. To the inhabitants and of Palestine alone, could he have used such half-doubting language as: Ye know Timothy, probably. For, though he accompanied Paul on his last visit to Jerusalem (Acts 20: 4), and, moreover, was not an obscure person, yet he was least known to the people of Palestine. The reason why he calls him merely *brother*, without further encomium, is, that he was not recommending him to any church on account of his being charged with a particular commission, as is the case in those Epistles in which he styles him his beloved son and his faithful fellow-laborer (1 Cor. 4: 17. 1 Thess. 3: 2). The expressions of friendship and affection contained in the Epistles to Timothy himself are of course not to be our standard here. It is likewise the case, however, in letters which he wrote to other churches, that he only terms him, Timothy our brother (2 Cor. 1: 1. Col. 1: 1). The last words: *with whom, if he come shortly, I will see you*, are peculiarly appropriate to Paul, and can be historically accounted for, if we suppose them to have been his. He promised the Philippians to send Timothy to them, as soon as his fate at Rome was finally decided (Philipp. 2: 19—24); and the Hebrews, that, as soon as Timothy should have returned, he would make them a visit with him. The mission of Timothy explains the condition, *ἐὰν τάχιστα ἔρχεται*, under which he promised the visit. A journey to the east was in the apostle's contemplation. It was his design to pass through Macedonia (Philipp. 2: 24) to Asia Minor (Philem. 22), and

<sup>1</sup> Schulz. p. 14, 15.

thence to Palestine. It was necessary, however, that he should gain information beforehand concerning the state of things in these countries, that he might not expose himself to his enemies to no purpose. This he did by staying for a time in Philippi, which was on one hand in Macedonia, and on the other, as it were, in sight of Asia Minor (Rom. 15: 23. Acts 20: 3). Now, whether the account which he received from Timothy, or Nero's persecution, which broke out in the autumn of Paul's release, or both together, caused him to give up his proposed journey or not, we cannot tell. It is probable, however, that the old design of a journey to Spain was now revived (Rom. 15: 28), and put in execution (§ 84).

However disinclined we may be, we must yet consider Paul as the author of the Epistle, so long as we have no good reason for supposing that Timothy was not under his direction when the Epistle was written. Can the writer have been of less than apostolic dignity? No one with less authority could have presumed to present to the parent-land of Christianity his instructions and intervention in relation to such topics, under the very eyes of the apostles and of numerous witnesses of our Lord's words and deeds.

### § 147.

While internal grounds speak so clearly and decisively in favor of Paul, so it does not appear that we have any reason to apprehend a different result from a historico-critical investigation. We must simply make it a rule not to decide from individual declarations and detached statements, but to form our opinion impartially from a view of the whole history of the Epistle.

Eusebius, in stating the opinions of the ancients in regard to what is called the Canon, ranks among the biblical works which were universally acknowledged to be genuine the fourteen Epistles of Paul then comprehended in the Mss. of the New Testament, without excepting any one of them.<sup>1</sup> It cannot be denied that when he did this his attention was directed to the Greek and oriental churches, rather than to the Latin. For he must have been specially familiar with the opinions and convictions of the former, considering his language, residence, and literary education, and the libraries (at Cæsarea and Ælia Capitolina) whence he derived his documents. He has, however, in another place, expressed himself more to the purpose: "Fourteen Epistles of Paul, he says, are generally acknowledged and genuine, *πρόδηλοι καὶ σαφεῖς*; but it is not to be concealed that some depreciate that to the Hebrews, on the ground that the Roman church objects to it."<sup>2</sup> Now these *some*, *τίνες*, may be Latins, (though it is not probable in this connexion), or they may be Greeks; it makes no essential difference which. In the first case, the writer has no reference at all to the general opinion of the Greeks, and in the second case, he only presents an exception from the general opinion of the Greeks, an exception which existed in the minds of individuals out of respect or prepossession towards the Romans, and which proves, according to the well-known rule, *exceptio firmat regu-*

<sup>1</sup> Euseb. H. E. L. III. c. 23.

<sup>2</sup> Euseb. H. E. L. III. c. 3.



*Iam*, that the Greek church, taken as a whole, did not think as these *some* did in regard to the Pauline origin of the Epistle, but acknowledged it.

Jerome, therefore, who had certainly perused a large number of the writings of Christian Greeks, did not exaggerate, when he asserted in his Epistle to Dardanus that Paul had always been acknowledged as author of the Epistle to the Hebrews by all Greek writers, "*ab omnibus retro ecclesiasticis Græci sermonis scriptoribus.*"

Origen, too, expresses himself in the same collective way concerning *the ancients*. This expression, used by a man in the third century, has a very important meaning, and would seem to carry us back near to the times of the apostles: "It was not without reason," says he, "that the ancients transmitted this Epistle to us as Paul's production."<sup>1</sup>

There are other witnesses of the Alexandrian school in favor of this Epistle, both earlier and later than Origen. Dionysius, who is characterized by his investigations respecting the Apocalypse as an intelligent and honest father, declares, in the work referred to, in favor of Paul.<sup>2</sup> Clement, earlier than either, maintained the Pauline origin of this Epistle.

Nor were investigations of this sort prosecuted lightly or unwarily in

<sup>1</sup> Οὐ γὰρ εἰκὴ οἱ ἀρχαῖοι ἄνδρες ὡς Παύλου ἀντὶν παραδεδοῖναι. Euseb. H. E. L. VI. 25. This celebrated passage in Origen, to which we have already referred in speaking of the language of this Epistle, still continues to be misinterpreted to the prejudice of the Epistle. The opinion of the Alexandrians, that the language of the Epistle differs from that of Paul, is the writer's *theme*; and the order of his ideas is as follows. 1. The style is not Paul's; 2. for it has too much Greek regularity and elegance. 3. Yet, as to the thoughts, the production is not inferior to Paul's Epistles. 4. Hence he (Origen) is of opinion that the thoughts are Paul's; but that their phraseology and construction are the work of some one else, who reduced to writing what was said by Paul. Thus far he distinguishes between the words and ideas, what belongs to Paul and what does not; and then proceeds. 6. Any church which has regarded it as Paul's production may retain its favorable opinion of it; 7. for it was not without reason that the ancients transmitted it to us as Paul's production. 8. But, who composed this Epistle (referring to No. 5) is known to God alone; 9. some say Clement, others Luke. The propositions No. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, exhibit his ideas in regard to the substance and the phraseology, and a mode of reconciling their characteristics. No. 6 asserts the propriety of regarding it as Pauline. No. 7 alone contains a *historical statement, the testimony of the ancients*. Thus much as to who was its author. Nos. 8 and 9. Who, however, according to the proposed theory, reduced it to writing, cannot be known; this merit has been ascribed to various persons. *The historical statement on the subject is fully and definitely expressed*; the rest of the passage consists of attempts to invalidate the objection drawn from the difference of language.

Origen has always acknowledged this Epistle in his works, and very frequently cited it under the designation ὁ ἀποστολος and ὁ Παῦλος. We will refer to those passages only, in which the Epistle is mentioned by name. Καὶ ἐν τῇ πρὸς Ἑβραίους ὁ αὐτὸς Παῦλος (Comm. in Joann. T. II. c. 6). Ὁ δὲ Παῦλος ἐν τῇ πρὸς Ἑβραίους (in Joann. T. X. c. 11). Ὡς ὁ Παῦλος ἐν τῇ πρὸς Ἑβραίους (Select. in Ps. Ps. 4: 7). Ὁ Παῦλος Ἑβραίους φησί (in Ps. 8: 6). Αἶγει γὰρ ἐν τῇ πρὸς Ἑβραίους ὁ αὐτὸς Παῦλος (Select. in Thren. 4: 20), and the passage adduced by Lardner and others (Epist. ad African. c. 9): "If any one, perplexed by this argument (taken from Heb. 11: 37), should adopt the opinion of those who deprive Paul of this Epistle, against such an one I should make use of proofs from other quarters that the Epistle was Paul's."

<sup>2</sup> Euseb. H. E. L. VI. c. 41.



Alexandria. This city, it is well known, always possessed a multitude of able grammarians, who labored with great critical acumen on the writings of ancient classic authors, amended the text when it had been impaired, and distinguished on critical grounds between genuine and spurious works.

This critical talent was exercised likewise upon the books of the New Testament, and particularly on this Epistle. The remark was early made that its style was strikingly different from that of Paul. Notwithstanding this idea, which would seem to lead directly to the supposition that Paul was not its author, no one ventured to deny that it was the apostle's production. So strong was the conviction that it could not be shaken, even by weighty adverse considerations.

Ways and means were sought to compromise the matter. The hypothesis of Clement and that afterwards presented by Origen are but attempts to reconcile the difference of style with history and the declarations of antiquity, which pronounced Paul to be the author.

Clement, in particular, cites such an ancient declaration of a respectable father, whom he calls *the blessed old man*, and who from the connexion was probably Pantænus. He inquires into the reason why Paul did not prefix his name and his title, *ἀπόστολος*, to his Epistle.<sup>1</sup> I must here confess myself unable to comprehend how it is possible that men in modern times should suppose some Alexandrian to have been the author of this Epistle, while in the Alexandrian church itself, the evidence in behalf of Paul reaches so nearly to the first century. If the author of these Epistles was an Alexandrian, where could the fact be known, if not at Alexandria?

To invalidate the testimony of Pantænus, it has been recently affirmed by a learned man, that when he proposed the query why Paul did not call himself apostle in the Epistle to the Hebrews, he entertained doubts in regard to its authorship. It is astonishing that a scholar of such eminence should assert any thing so hastily. Were Clement and Origen ever in doubt in regard to the Epistle, though they proposed inquiries concerning it? Did Julius Africanus, and others before him, doubt as to the Gospel of Matthew and Luke, because they sought the reason of the difference between them in regard to the genealogy of our Lord? Long before his time, Tatian, while yet resident at Rome and orthodox in his opinions, had drawn up biblical *προβλήματα*, which he and Rhodon after him, promised to solve.<sup>2</sup> Biblical questions of this nature must have arisen more naturally at Alexandria than at any other place, because there *προβλήματα* and *ζητήματα Ὀμηρικὰ*, *λυσεῖς ζητημάτων Ὀμηρικῶν*, and such like subjects of inquiry, were common. Let us, as we ought, examine the declaration of the blessed old man. His language is: As our Lord was sent among the Jews as the apostle of the Almighty (Heb. 3: 1), Paul, particularly as his mission was to the heathen, would not presume to style himself apostle to the Hebrews, from reverence for our Lord, and because he had written the Epistle to the Hebrews out of the abundance of his zeal, although he was really a messenger and apostle

<sup>1</sup> Clem. Alex. Hypotypos. apud Euseb. H. E. L. VI. c. 14. Rob. Steph. p. 62.

<sup>2</sup> Euseb. H. E. L. V. c. 13.

to the Gentiles. Pantænus here represents as undoubted what he is said to have doubted, viz. that Paul wrote the Epistle to the Hebrews; and says that he had two reasons for withholding the usual introduction, *Paul the apostle* etc.

In Lower Egypt the Epistle to the Hebrews retained its place immediately after that to the Galatians till about the fourth century, as we see from the list of chapters in the *Codex Vaticanus*;<sup>1</sup> and it was not till about the time of Athanasius, that it was removed and placed after the 2d of Thessalonians, which situation it now holds in Egyptian Mss. In the Upper Egyptian version it even stood before that to the Galatians, immediately after the 2d to the Corinthians,<sup>2</sup> which is deserving of notice in illustration of the ancient opinion respecting it in Egypt.

Jerome connects with the account we have mentioned above, respecting the agreement of the ancient Greek fathers as to this Epistle, a declaration that the oriental churches likewise,<sup>3</sup> in the vicinity of which he lived so long in his solitary abode at Bethlehem, agreed in the same position. His statement is confirmed by Augustine's assertion, that in the oriental churches the Epistle ranked among the canonical writings.<sup>4</sup> We shall suppose our readers to be acquainted with the canon of the church at Jerusalem, as stated by Cyril, from the first part of our Introduction; nor shall we make particular mention of the evidence of Titus of Bostra (*Contra Manich.* L. III. c. 4 and 11), of Basil, the two Gregories, Epiphanius, Pamphilus, and Methodius.

Ephræm, the most noted of the Syrian fathers, appeals in several passages to this composition, characterizing the writer by the designation, the apostle.<sup>5</sup> James of Nisibis, Ephræm's teacher, composed various Syriac productions as early as the third century, some of which have reached us in an Armenian version. He appeals in these to the Epistle to the Hebrews, under the designation, the apostle, or the blessed apostle.<sup>6</sup>

Soon after the middle of the third century we find in hither Syria, instead of individual fathers, a whole ecclesiastical council; the synod of Antioch, quoting the scriptures, and among other passages, Heb. 2: 14. 4: 15. and 11: 26, in the summons which they issued to Paul of Samosata before his removal from his station.<sup>7</sup> Going back to the second century, we are able to appeal to the oldest version of the Syrians, a monument of their belief and conviction in regard to the canon. Now this, although it excludes some of the Catholic Epistles, contains the

<sup>1</sup> Hug, "De antiquitate Cod. Vatic." p. 23, 24.

<sup>2</sup> Zoega, "Catalogus Codd. Coptic. in Museo Borgiano." L. III. Codd. Sahidic. N. LXXX. p. 186. Engelbrecht, "Fragmenta Basmurico-Coptica, p. XXV.

<sup>3</sup> "Nostris dicendum est, hanc epistolam, quæ inscribitur ad Hebræos, non solum ab ecclesiis ORIENTIS, sed ab omnibus retro ecclesiasticis Græci sermonis scriptoribus, quasi Pauli Apostoli suscipi." Epist. ad Dardan.

<sup>4</sup> "Ad Hebræos quoque Epistola, quamquam nonnullis incerta sit . . . magis me movet auctoritas ecclesiarum orientalium, quæ hanc etiam in canonicis habent." Expos. in Epist. ad Rom. T. IV. Opp. Ed. Basil. p. 1180.

<sup>5</sup> Ephræm Opp. Syr. T. I. p. 400.

<sup>6</sup> Galland, Biblioth. Patr. T. V. p. XVI. and p. LXXXVIII.

<sup>7</sup> Mansi, Collect. Concil. T. I. p. 1034.

Epistle to the Hebrews, which, as we proved before, when speaking of this version, is a genuine and original portion of it.

If we have recourse to the heretics, we know that Manes, whose sect spread particularly in Syria and Mesopotamia, appealed to the authority of this Epistle to prove his position, that the Old and New Testaments did not derive their origin from one and the same author.<sup>1</sup>

The Melchisedeckians, who originated with Theodotus (ἀγορευτικοί-βός or τραπεζίτης), elevated Melchisedeck above Christ, and in doing this relied on the Epistle to the Hebrews (Heb. 7: 3, and 7: 4, 7).<sup>2</sup> In the second century we have the Montanists, who first made their appearance in Phrygia, and extended themselves westward. These founded their principal distinctive doctrines on the Epistle to the Hebrews (6: 4), as we shall shortly see.

The Epistle continued without opposition to enjoy this established authority and estimation among the Greeks and in the East; and it was not till the time of Arius that any church in these countries disputed its title. The Arians were the first Greeks whom history charges with denying its Pauline origin.<sup>3</sup>

This circumstance confers uncommon importance on the testimony of Eusebius in favor of this Epistle, and accredits his character as a historian, it being evident that he was not misled by any adherence to party into a want of fidelity to history. Theodoret even referred the Arians, on the subject of this Epistle, to the example of this their fellow believer, that they might be edified by it and learn moderation.<sup>4</sup>

\* \* \* \* \*

The primitive times of the church of Rome present us an illustrious witness for this Epistle in the person of Clement, who occupied there the station of the apostles after their death. In his Epistle to the church at Corinth, he quotes passages from it, as Eusebius and Jerome have already observed, and as we can see ourselves on examining the Epistle, which has come down to us. He does not, indeed, cite it under the name of the apostle, but makes use of it without mentioning the author, employing its peculiar phraseology, *αὐτολεξεὶ χορησάμενος*, and *juxta verborum quoque ordinem*.<sup>5</sup> Nor has he designated by name the author of any book of the New Testament from which passages have been borrowed by him, except the 1st Epistle of Paul to the Corinthians, the author of which is expressly mentioned, because his letter, likewise, was directed to them, and a reference to the apostle by name was, considering the circumstances, very natural. We will not now draw any inference from the citations of Clement out of the Epistle to the Hebrews but that which Eusebius draws: *ὅτι μὴ νέον ὑπάρχει*

<sup>1</sup> Epiphanius. Hæres. LXVI. §. 74. Ed. Petav. *Εἴτα πάλιν λέγει ὁ αὐτὸς Μανῆς, οὐ δύναται ἐνὸς διδασκαλίου εἶναι παλαιὰ καὶ καινὴ διαθήκη. Ἡ μὲν γὰρ παλαιού-ται ἡμέραν ἐξ ἡμέρας, ἡ δὲ ἀνακαινίσκῃται ἡμέραν καθ' ἡμέραν, πᾶν γὰρ παλαιού-μενον καὶ γηράσκον, ἐγγυὲς ἀφανισμοῦ γίνεται* (Heb. VIII. 13).

<sup>2</sup> Epiphanius. XXXV. or LV. § 1 (Heb. 7: 3); § 8 (Heb. 7: 4, 7). Comp. Tertullian. De Præscriptione, towards the end.

<sup>3</sup> Theodoret, Prolog. in Ep. ad Hebr. Epiphanius. Hæres. LXIX. § 27.

<sup>4</sup> Theodoret, Prolog. in Ep. ad Hebr.

<sup>5</sup> Euseb. H. E. L. III. c. 38. Hieronymus. in Catal. V. Clem.



τὸ σύγγραμμα. But we must remark, that Eusebius, in his language, seems to have had a covert polemical reference to the western church, placing in contrast with it the Greek churches, which were supported by the oldest ecclesiastical document of Rome itself in regarding the Epistle, not as a recent production, but as one of Paul's writings: *οὕτως εἰκότως ἔδοξεν αὐτὸ τοῖς λοιποῖς ἐγκαταλεχθῆναι γράμμασι τοῦ ἀποστόλου*.

Irenæus, too, in his book, *Περὶ διαλέξεων διαφόρων*, quoted from it, whether with or without the name of the author we do not know;<sup>1</sup> while, on the other hand, in his books against the heretics, he has so far avoided the use of it, that only slight traces of it are here and there visible.<sup>2</sup>

Now how shall we explain the strange procedure of the Greek father in this last work? I think it may be correctly explained from the circumstances of the times and of his life. His ecclesiastical relations connected him with the western Christians, among whom he possessed consideration and authority. These were called into active exercise by the sect of the Cataphrygians or Montanists. Commissions to Eleutherus at Rome,<sup>3</sup> relative to these heretics, had even been performed by him on behalf of the Gallic churches, before he had completed his heresiological work.<sup>4</sup> The third book was not written before the latter days of Eleutherus, and the whole was not finished till the time of his successor.

Now these Montanists had recourse, in defence of their principle, that they who had been guilty of aggravated crimes could no longer remain in the church, to the Epistle to the Hebrews, 6: 4, 5. This passage was one of their chief arguments, as we learn from Jerome.<sup>5</sup>

But, even without his testimony, we should be persuaded of this by the actual fact in regard to the procedure of a zealous Montanist. Tertullian warmly defended the doctrine of the Montanists from Heb. 6: 4, 5, in his book "*De pudicitia*," which he wrote expressly in support of their position, and he laid more stress on this passage than on any other of his arguments.

If, therefore, the fathers of the Latin church made use of this Epistle cautiously and fearfully, till they finally rejected it, history presents us with the reason of their doing so. For, that the proof-text was not easily answered, may be inferred from the various attempts to answer it made by the ancients.

Irenæus, it is probable, had not long been dead, when the opposition to the Epistle in the Roman church had extended itself widely. Caius, *Γάιος*, one of its presbyters under Zephyrinus, declared expressly in a controversial work, that he acknowledged only thirteen Epistles of Paul, and did not regard that to the Hebrews as the apostle's production.

<sup>1</sup> Euseb. H. E. L. V. c. 27.

<sup>2</sup> Massuet, Dissert. in Iren. D. III. Art. II. n. 7.

<sup>3</sup> Euseb. H. E. L. V. c. 47.

<sup>4</sup> Massuet, Dissert. II. Art. II. n. 47.

<sup>5</sup> L. II. Adv. Jovinian. n. 3. "*Verum ne Montanus et Novatus hic rideant, qui contendunt non posse renovari per pœnitentiam eos qui semel sunt illuminati,*" etc. Heb. 6: 4, 5.



The work was directed against the Montanists, and particularly against Proculus, one of their most learned advocates, *τῆς Καταφοργίας αἰρέσεως ὑπερμαχοῦντα*. This circumstance, again, gives us satisfactory information as to the reason why this Epistle was so troublesome to him, and why he so positively rejected it.

From this time the greater part of the Latins adopted these opinions, and, till the fourth century, they constantly denied that Paul was the author of this Epistle.<sup>1</sup> History, however, does not give ground for supposing them to have been so unreasonable as to deny that the Epistle belonged to apostolic times, and that its author was of that age.<sup>2</sup> How could they do this, when Clement's Epistle from Rome was in so many hands? The author of the remarkable fragment in Muratori, who represents himself as living about the time of Caius, constitutes the only exception, and was so ungracious as to denominate the Epistle "*apud Alexandrinus Pauli nomine fictam ad hæresin Marcionis*."<sup>3</sup> Thus the apostle himself must be termed a heretic, that a self-willed man may maintain his orthodoxy.<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Euseb. H. E. L. VI. c. 21. Ἠλθε δὲ καὶ εἰς ἡμᾶς καὶ Γαῖον λογιωτάτου ἀνδρὸς διάλογος ἐπὶ Ρώμης κατὰ Ζεφυρίνον πρὸς Πρόκλον . . . ἐν ᾧ . . . τοῦ ἱεροῦ ἀποστόλου δεκατριῶν μονῶν ἐπιστολῶν μνημονεύει, τὴν πρὸς Ἑβραίους μὴ συναριθμησας ταῖς λοιπαῖς· ἐπεὶ καὶ εἰς δεῦρο παρὰ Ῥωμαίων τιῶν οὐ νομίζεται τοῦ ἀποστόλου τυγχάνειν. Hieronym. in Catal. V. Caius. "In eodem volumine (disputatione advers. Proculum) epistolas Pauli tredecim numerans, decimam quartam quæ fertur ad Hebræos, dicit ejus non esse: sed et apud Romanos usque hodie Pauli non habetur." Comp. Photius, Cod. 48.

<sup>2</sup> Hieronym. Catal. V. Paulus. Philastr. De Hæres. c. 88. Primasius, Comment. Præf. in Ep. ad Hebr.

<sup>3</sup> Tom. III. Antiqq. Ital. Med. Ævi. p. 854. That in these words he intends the Epistle to the Hebrews is clear from the subjoined citation of Heb. 12: 15, by which he characterises the Epistle.

<sup>4</sup> I must here justify myself in opposition to Prof. Herm. Olshausen ("Die Echtheit der vier kanonischen Evangelien," p. 281 seq.), for assigning this remarkable fragment to the beginning of the third century. I may have erred in not ascribing it like others to Caius himself; at any rate there is no necessity of supposing it at all older. The decision of the subject depends on the words: "Pastorem nuperrime nostris temporibus in urbe Romæ Hermas conscripsit, sedente cathedrâ Romanæ ecclesiæ Pio episcopo fratre ejus." The expression *nuperrime* is indefinite; but is rendered less so by the addition *nostris temporibus*, in our time. Hence *nuperrime* does not signify much more than οὐ πάλαι does in a very similar designation of time in Eusebius (L. V. c. 28): οὐ πάλαι, ἀλλ' ἐπὶ τῶν ἡμετέρων γεγόμενος καιρῶν. Is it asked whether Caius could have been alive when Pius was at the head of the church of Rome? We know that he wrote under Zephyrinus, who became bishop of the church in the ninth year of Severus (Euseb. H. E. L. V. c. 28). It will be best for us to reckon from Hyginus, because we have a definite date in regard to his elevation to the episcopal office. It occurred in the 1st year of Antoninus Pius (Euseb. H. E. L. IV. c. 10). At the end of four years he had Pius for his successor, who died 15 years afterwards (Euseb. L. IV. c. 11), i. e. in the 19th year of Antoninus. From the 19th year of Antoninus to the 8th of Severus, we must reckon as follows: the remaining 4 years of Antoninus, 19 for the reign of Marcus Aurelius, 13 for Commodus, and 9 of the reign of Severus; in all 45. Supposing Caius to have been 55 years old when he wrote against Proculus under Zephyrinus, he of course lived during the supernumerary years under Pius. Thus, chronology does not forbid us to consider Caius and the author of the fragment as contemporary, and, indeed, the same person. Supposing the writer to have been a different person, he cannot certainly have lived any earlier than he, for Eusebius does not

Even the Montanists yielded to this opinion, and, in their polemical writings, ascribed no higher authority to the Epistle than was admitted to belong to it by their opponents, i. e. as being the production of some apostolic father, like Barnabas, Clement, etc. This was Tertullian's course, who as early as the time of Zephyrinus, had been with others an observer of these disputes and of the procedure of Caius, and in a short time was the successor of Proculus in reputation and learning, and his warmest admirer: "*Proculus nostræ virginis senectæ et Christianæ eloquentiæ dignitas.*" To return to our subject. As the Epistle was denied to be Paul's, Tertullian took it for what it was allowed to be by its enemies, and reasoned with such force as to make it, even on this ground, equal in authority and value, or very nearly so at least, with Paul's Epistles.

The passage is a remarkable one. It shows us how anxious he was to recover for the Epistle on one side what he yielded on the other, in regard to Paul's authorship of it, and to refer it, at least mediately, to Paul. "*Volo ex abundantia alicujus comitis apostolorum testimonium super inducere idoneum confirmandi de proximo jure disciplinam magistrorum.* Exstat enim et Barnabæ titulus ad Hebræos, adeo satis auctoritatis viro, ut quem *Paulus juxta se posuerit* in abstinentiæ tenore: Aut ego solus et Barnabas non habemus hoc operandi potestatem. Est utique receptior apud ecclesias epistola Barnabæ, illo apocrypho Pastore mœchorum. Monens igitur discipulos omissis omnibus initiis ad perfectionem magis tendere, nec rursum fundamenta pœnitentiæ jacere operibus mortuorum, Impossible est, inquit, illos qui semel illuminati sunt, etc. Heb. 6: 4, 5. . . . Hoc qui ab apostolis didicit, et cum apostolis docuit, nunquam mœcho et fornicatori secundam pœnitentiam promissam ab apostolis norat" (De Pudic. c. 20).

Thus were the two parties contending, when in the heat of the contest a new sect reinforced the Montanists. Circumstances became pressing, and the orthodox had not leisure to become reconciled to the Epistle. About forty years after the declaration of Caius, at the time of the death of Cornelius, the Novatians appeared in Rome. They revived the position of Montanus in regard to repentance, and styled themselves *the pure*. In adopting his tenet, they also appropriated to themselves his arguments in its support, and the passage on which they placed special reliance was, likewise, Heb. 6: 4, 5.

Jerome, in the Epistle before referred to, speaks of this passage.<sup>1</sup> Augustine, in citing it, alludes to the Novatians, whom he calls *mundos* (*καθαρούς*), and refutes the opinion which they built upon it in respect to repentance.<sup>2</sup> Epiphanius considers these words as the principal source of their heresy.<sup>3</sup> Theodoret charges them with making use of

---

mention any express opposition to the Epistle to the Hebrews in the west, earlier than that of Caius. Besides, the designations of time and place, which the author of the fragment gives in regard to himself, the language which he has employed (the Greek), and the character of the position he presents relative to the Epistle to the Hebrews, all declare in favor of Caius.

<sup>1</sup> Hieronym. Ep. ad. Dardan.

<sup>2</sup> Augustine, De verâ et falsâ pœnitentiâ, C. 3. L. IV. Opp. Ed. Basil. 1559.

<sup>3</sup> Epiph. Hær. LIX. De Catharis. Σφάλλει αὐτοὺς τὸ ῥητὸν τοῦ ἀποστόλου εἰρημένον, Ἀδύνατον τοῖς ἁπλῶς φωτισθέντας κ. τ. λ.

the passage in support of error, and opposes his own interpretation to theirs.<sup>1</sup> Macarius, the Egyptian, adds to the words in Heb. 6: 4, 5, other passages in this Epistle, which were likewise misinterpreted, *κατὰ Ναβατιάνων φρόνημα*.<sup>2</sup> Abulpharagius even introduces a Novatian speaking, and proving his opinion from this passage.<sup>3</sup> Eulogius, Bishop of Alexandria, entered into an extended discussion in his book against the Novatians, for the purpose of analyzing this passage and defending it against their interpretation; a long extract from which discussion is given us by Photius.<sup>4</sup> So truly was this passage the main argument of the heretics, that it required and employed the ability and ingenuity of the most noted fathers.

Thus the conduct of the two churches, in regard to one and the same subject, was very different. The Greeks endeavored to evade the argument by their mode of interpretation, while the Latins rejected the Epistle entirely. Circumstances contained the reason of this difference. The Greeks were calmer and less interested spectators, while the scene of this controversy was among the Latins, in Rome itself, and the leaders of the respective parties were in their midst. The Latins had not leisure to look on, till an exegetical treatise was composed, which might be made use of to silence the disputants. Thus, while the Greek church admitted the Epistle, although the heretics regarded it as their principal reliance, the Latins were compelled, on account of their situation, to take a more expeditious method, and to proceed as they did, viz. to deny the authority of the Epistle, the contents of which were unanswerable, or else to be vanquished in the controversy. This was the true reason of their procedure, and when Philastrius honestly admits that the public church-use of the Epistle, was interdicted on account of the Novatians,<sup>5</sup> he ought not any longer to be subjected to abuse for his assertion.

What wonder now, that Cyprian, who had so many disputes in regard to the restoration of backsliders, does not even mention the Epistle, and indeed, seems to be ignorant of its existence?

There is no doubt, too, that Hippolytus did not admit it, but he cannot in this case be considered a Greek, nor, as some would wish, an Oriental; for he was guided in his opinion on this point by Irenæus, and the work in which his declaration respecting this Epistle appears, was his history of heresies, which he composed in a great measure *ὁμιλοῦντος Ἰουναίου*.<sup>6</sup>

Still, such serious ferments among the Latins could not continue long unknown to the Greeks, and it is easy to imagine that some, *τινές*,

<sup>1</sup> Theodoret, Comment. in Epist. ad Hebr. c. VI. *Ταῦτα οἱ Νόβατον κατὰ τῆς ἀληθείας ὀπλίονσι ῥητά.*

<sup>2</sup> Macarii Monachi Opusc. III. De Pœnit. Galland. Biblioth. PP. T. VIII. p. 32.

<sup>3</sup> Historia Dynastiarum. p. 137 Arabic text, and p. 86 Latin.

<sup>4</sup> Photius, Codex. 280. p. 880. Ed. Hæschelii.

<sup>5</sup> Philastr. Adv. Hær. c. 88. "Non legitur . . . de pœnitentiâ propter Novatianos."

<sup>6</sup> The principal passage relating to this point is Photius, Codex 121. p. 161. Hæschel., where Photius derived his representation from Hippolytus himself, independently of Gobar.



as Eusebius states, shared in their sentiments, and rejected the Epistle on the authority of the church of Rome.

But what were the arguments presented by the Roman church? Was their procedure occasioned merely by the pressure of circumstances, which it was desirable and necessary to conceal by false pretexts? or were the Montanist and Novatian disputes, which evidently and undeniably had an influence upon it, merely the occasion of a well-grounded opposition, which the controversy but kindled and animated? Did they, or did Caius, adduce ancient declarations of credible men, or trustworthy historical witnesses and authorities, which pronounced against Paul and in favor of some other author?

In that case the dispute would certainly have worn a very different aspect; but far from appealing to the *traditio ecclesiarum*, to authorities of the earlier periods of the church, as was demanded in historical investigation, and as was usual in regard to questions respecting the Canon and points of doctrine, the inquiry received a totally different direction. In the whole Latin church there is not one father, of whose talents and learning any monuments remain, who appears to have known any thing of such a *traditio ecclesiæ*, or of any historical proof. The question was made to rest on internal evidence alone.

The Epistle, they said, is an anonymous composition, the author of which, contrary to Paul's custom, nowhere names himself, and consequently, cannot be known.<sup>1</sup> Its style differs from that of the apostle, in its elegance and rhetorical finish, which he despised.<sup>2</sup> Besides, there occur in it, citations from the Old Testament which are no longer to be found in the prophets or other canonical books of the Jews.<sup>3</sup>

These are the principal reasons brought forward by the Latins to justify their opposition. There were others, as, e. g. "quia addiderunt in ea quidam non bene sentientes, et quia factum Christum dicit," etc. which, it is evident, bear no comparison with these.

By such pretexts the Latins justified their procedure, and they, who in other cases knew very well how to make use of the argument from tradition, did not, in this, say a single word respecting the testimony of antiquity or the statements of earlier fathers. In short, history properly so called did not to their knowledge afford the slightest evidence against Paul; and the whole dispute was conducted on exegetical grounds, the investigation and estimate of which are in our own power, and subject to our own decision.

On the other hand, the two fathers, Jerome and Augustine, who, with their extensive erudition outweigh all other western authorities together, were convinced of the genuineness of the Epistle by the testimony of the ancients. They therefore held up before their contemporaries the *traditio* of the Greeks and Orientals, and labored to give

<sup>1</sup> "Ad Hebræos . . . ubi principium salutationum de industriâ omisit . . . unde nonnulli eum in canonem scripturarum recipere timuerunt." Augustin. Expos. in Ep. ad Rom. Tom. IV. Opp. Ed. Basil, 1556. p. 1180. Primasius Uticens. Præf. in Comm. in univers. Pauli Epp.

<sup>2</sup> "Non ejus dicitur propter styli sermonisque dissonantiam. "Hieronim. Cat. V. Paulus. "Quod rhetorice scripserit, et sermone plausibili." Philastrius. Hær. c. 61. Primasius, l. c.

<sup>3</sup> Hieron. Comm. in Esai. L. III. c. 6. T. IV. Opp. p. 97. Valars.



another direction to the general sentiment. They would not probably have succeeded, had they not been able to enforce their opinion by an ecclesiastical council. This was the third or fourth Carthaginian council, over which Augustine exercised great influence. In the catalogue of canonical books which it issued in the form of a decree of the council, it reckoned "*Pauli epistolas tredecim, ejusdem ad Hebræos unam.*"

From this time the Latins began to change their sentiments. Innocent, in his Epistle to Exuperius of Toulouse, in speaking of the canon, reckoned fourteen Epistles of Paul. The Epistle came into general use in the Roman and Latin churches, and the opposition to it ceased every where, with the exception, however, of Spain. At least, Isidore of Seville, in the 7th century, had doubts in regard to it. But he is the only writer who expresses any at so late a period. Thus, under the pressure of circumstances, the Christians of the west disparaged the Epistle, then gave color to their procedure by such reasons as they could get together, and finally, when the storm of party had subsided, restored it to its rightful rank.

### § 148.

The author appends at the close certain circumstances, of such a character that no one acquainted with his situation could easily fail to recognize the apostle. He promises his readers that he will visit them in company with Timothy, who was always connected with Paul, was his pupil and assistant, and his companion at Rome. He mentions him as having been liberated from prison. He subjoins salutations from those of Italy, who perhaps were persons that had visited the apostle in prison, like the deputies from other churches. For he himself was not yet set at liberty; whence he commends himself to the prayers of the pious Hebrews, that he may be restored to them the sooner. At all events, Paul could not fail to be recognized by these expressions at the end of the Epistle.

But why did he not prefix his name at the beginning, if it was he who wrote the Epistle? Clement of Alexandria, answers the question as follows: "When Paul wrote to the Hebrews, who were prejudiced against him, he prudently omitted prefixing his name, lest he should excite aversion at the outset."<sup>1</sup> It was certainly best that all those who were under the influence of prejudice when they received this Epistle, should first read, examine, judge impartially, and then decide for themselves. Should they afterwards suspect from circumstances, and finally become convinced that it was from Paul, they would already have become acquainted with the contents, and the ideas would have been imbibed into their minds and fastened there to produce their effect.

We have a second answer from Pantænus. He is of opinion that the usual salutation found at the beginning of Paul's Epistles: *Paul the apostle*, etc., could not properly be made use of in an Epistle to the Hebrews, inasmuch as he could not call himself *apostle* in reference to them, without giving offence (§ 147). Paul had certainly surrendered

<sup>1</sup> Euseb. H. E. L. VI. 14.

the office of apostle as far as Palestine was concerned, and by express agreement taken the Gentile nations as the province of his mission and labors (Gal. 2: 9, 10); and to call himself apostle to the Gentiles in a hortatory letter to the Jews, would have been neither fitting nor conciliatory.

A third answer may be drawn from the very plan of the Epistle. It begins with a rhetorical introduction, and has, generally, as little resemblance to a letter as the oration *Pro Lege Maniliâ*. As far as the doxology in 13: 12, it is entirely a rhetorical production. It is not till after this conclusion that any thing occurs which could give rise to a query if the discourse might not be a letter. Now whether this manner was intentional, in order to avoid the salutation at the outset, and with it the name *apostle*, or whether it was chosen for other reasons, it is sufficient that to prefix a salutation, after the manner of an Epistle, would have been infelicitous, considering the character of the introduction and of the whole Epistle.

All these replies are satisfactory. No one of them excludes the other, and hence there is nothing to prevent us from regarding them all as correct, if it be allowed that a reflecting mind may be determined by several considerations at once.

### § 149.

But whence, then, arises the dissimilarity between the style and language of this and of his other writings? The same mind reigns throughout the Epistles of Paul, it is true, but not always the same style. In the Epistles to the Corinthians, we observe the injured teacher, conscious of his worth and his deserts, cautious, benevolent, earnest, and vehement; in the Epistle to the Romans, the scholar, with a dignified, distant manner, the advocate of the Gentiles, abounding in Jewish learning; in that to the Galatians, the language of paternal authority to a people of little refinement, too much inclined to place dependence upon their good works. How very different is the tone of the Epistle to the Romans from that of the Epistle to the Galatians, though their subjects are very nearly the same? That to the Ephesians is solemnly devout; that to the Philippians is affectionate and friendly, but dignified; that to the Hebrews is elegant and elevated. His situation and his relation to the churches are depicted with extreme accuracy in the style of each of his Epistles.

As to his relation to the Christians of Palestine, he was not one of their teachers and paternal guides. He could never, therefore, adopt the tone which he might properly use towards churches which he himself had planted and reared.

If we consider the object which he had in view, viz. to weaken the impression of the splendid temple-service in Palestine, of the solemn offerings and imposing feasts, by showing that all this was constrained in Christianity, not sensibly and transiently, but spiritually and in a higher degree of perfection, we shall see that the unity of his subject naturally led him to the style of a treatise or discourse.

If we look at the general contents of the Epistle, we shall see that they demanded an elevated tone. The author, at the commencement,

speaks of Jesus as the express image of the Deity, of his exaltation above the angels and the whole creation, of his dignity as the Son and as the Creator of the world. He then proceeds to speak of the founder of Judaism, Moses, and of the regulations instituted by him for the purpose of establishing a religious state; then of the high-priesthood, and of every thing which made the Jewish religion externally imposing, or worthy of regard for the internal peace it imparted. He speaks of the highest things with which the Jew was conversant, and points out for each of them something more elevated in Christianity. Paul would not have evinced that peculiarly sound judgment in the selection of his style, which we know that he possessed, had he chosen any other manner than the rhetorical and elevated. But every one knows that this cannot be attained without elegant and lofty diction.

What objection can be made, moreover, against the supposition that Luke had something to do with the phraseology? He was, at this period, in such close intimacy with the apostle, that his coöperation in perfecting the composition in point of elegance is not at all improbable. Although the Epistle to the Philippians, which immediately preceded that to the Hebrews, avoids in a measure certain harsh, Hebraistic modes of construction, is more elegant in respect to the arrangement of clauses, more easy in the transitions it contains, and more thoroughly Greek in its manner and movement, than previous Epistles, yet the advance to the elegance of the Epistle to the Hebrews seems to me to be great for the period of time between them. The ancients thought they observed in the Epistle a resemblance to the style of Luke. This, with certain expressions and phrases, which are not natural to Paul, and occur, out of this Epistle, only in the writings of Luke, and particularly the Acts of the Apostles,<sup>1</sup> may be considered as confirming a supposition, which is in itself highly probable from the relations of intimacy which subsisted between the two men. It also reconciles all difficulties without any strained expedients, and brings that which, in particular, and indeed alone, makes against Paul, into harmony with the preponderating, and, indeed, imperious reasons for ascribing the production to Paul.

### § 150.

There is nothing at all, then, against Paul; on the contrary, every thing is in his favor, and proves the Epistle to be his. Its connexion with the circumstances of his life was as follows.

He returned to Palestine from his travels, at a time when Christianity in that country had reason to apprehend a dangerous crisis, when it was almost impossible to stay the apostasy of the Jews (Acts 21: 20, 21). Fame had represented him as a determined innovator, and an opponent of Moses, and had given rise to general ill-will towards him, to which he was a victim. He was seized in a tumult which arose against him, carried to Cæsarea, where he remained till he was transferred to Rome, as he had demanded, to receive his sentence (Acts 22: 23: seq.).

Under such sad prospects in regard to the duration of Christianity in Palestine he departed thence, probably with the depressing idea, that

<sup>1</sup> Grotius, Adnot. in Epist. ad Hebræos, at the beginning.

there, where with blood and suffering the principles of Jesus had been planted and maintained, and a numerous church had been gathered, Christianity would soon cease to exist. Such was the consolation which he carried with him to Rome, and it was almost an accurate view into futurity.

His fate eventually took a favorable turn. He was already certain of his acquittal, his liberation from prison was not far off, and the accusation of desecrating the temple, the punishment of which was death (*Jos. Bell. Jud. L. VI. c. 2. n. 4*), had been quashed. The consequence was, that he was able again to address, in the capacity of teacher, those who might have despised him on account of the reproach of his guilt. He resumed his former labors, and endeavored to oppose the evil which had long caused him sorrow, to confirm the wavering in Palestine, to encourage those who continued faithful, and, when possible, to restore those who had relapsed.

It was an extremely difficult task, which he had undertaken. But just acquitted, he might occasion new accusations against himself, if with boldness and openness, as was his custom, he maintained the inutility of the ancient religion; and besides, in the present disposition of his readers, it was to be feared that he might forever incur their aversion, and even hasten the step which he wished to prevent. But what he conceded to the Jews he conceded only to truth, to his principles, and to his conscience. Paul knew how to unite these two things; he did not deviate for a moment from his convictions and his former preaching, and yet granted them all they required. They wished for offerings and days of expiation, altars for sacrifice, and high priests, and he was so far from questioning the propriety of their requisitions, that he appeared ready to grant them every thing; but, on the other hand, he showed very happily, that they possessed the whole already in Christianity, that Christianity was nothing else than refined Judaism, before which the gross Judaism of former times must completely disappear. And in fact it did disappear entirely, while he proved that all which was admirable in it was found in its highest degree of excellence and purity in Christianity. Thus, they could regard themselves as perfect Jews in the school of Christ, until they comprehended the religion of Jesus in spirit and in truth, and then first they saw to their astonishment that they were no longer Jews and never had been; and, since for every requisition of sense he had supplied a spiritual idea, they were worshippers in spirit, without being themselves conscious of it.

I am not afraid of committing an error in placing this Epistle by the side of Paul's best productions, and bringing it into comparison with the Epistles to the Corinthians. In these, he considerably and cautiously weighed his instructions, entreaties, reproofs, and, indeed, every expression, with the intention of calming minds which had been excited by designing persons and exasperated by mutual injuries; of destroying the influence of external disturbers of their peace; and while the church was in a divided and distracted condition, ready to fall to pieces completely, or at least to lose a large proportion of its members, in consequence of the slightest imprudence on his part, of bringing them all together again and reconciling them,—a task which only an extremely prudent man could accomplish. The object of the Epistle to the Hebrews was not



much less difficult of attainment. To gain ascendancy over minds passionately attached to the religious institutions of their ancestors, as also over the national feeling which was deeply rooted with this preference and was newly awakened and called into operation by the circumstances of the time; to deal with sensitive and excited men in so tender a manner as to heal without paining them; to weaken the constant influence exerted by the public festivals, which could not be at once annihilated, and this without depreciating them in a direct attack, which would have widened the breach, required uncommon qualifications. If the Epistles to the Corinthians demanded a careful reference to the intricate condition of that church, this Epistle required a cautious regard to ancient religious prepossessions, which were not to be allowed to remain and still were not to be directly attacked, and the ability to give them a spiritual application instead of passing them by unnoticed. As the former express, along with the deepest earnestness, emotions of friendly sympathy and kindness, so this likewise exhibits a moving tenderness, although its tone is extremely solemn.

As in the former the writer was guided by prudence and acquaintance with human nature, in the latter prudence and learning are prominently displayed. The chief difference between them arose from the circumstance, that in the case of the former Epistles the apostle employed discreet men to coöperate with him on the spot, in order to be more sure of his object, while in the other case he was compelled to trust solely to the influence of his Epistle.

To this production, it would seem, Paul devoted the serene hours immediately preceding his liberation. He had apparently just begun to expect his release, which, according to our investigations concerning the chronology of the Acts, took place in the beginning of the tenth year of Nero's reign.

### CHAPTER III.

#### THE CATHOLIC EPISTLES.

#### § 151.

The didactic writings of the apostles were separated into two collections; the one comprising the Epistles of Paul, and bearing generally the title *ἀπόστολος*, the other containing the Epistles of the rest of the apostles, with the title *καθολικαὶ ἐπιστολαί*, or *καθολικαὶ ἐπιστολαὶ τῶν ἀποστόλων*.

This last denomination appears frequently in the works of Origen. He, however, applied it to the 1st Epistle of Peter to the exclusion of the second, although the latter was known to him, and to the 1st of John, without conferring it on the 2d and 3d.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Τὸ ἀπὸ τῆς Ἰωάννου καθολικῆς ἐπιστολῆς οὕτως ἔχον (Tom. XVII. in Matth. p. 797). *Ὅπερ παραστήσομεν καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ Ἰωάννου καθολικῆς ἐπιστολῆς* (In

Dionysius of Alexandria, too, calls only the 1st of John τὴν καθολικὴν ἐπιστολήν, and in speaking soon after of two others, he applies to them the word *γερόμενος*.<sup>1</sup>

Origen's phraseology, and the passage in Dionysius which seems to contrast with each other the *καθολικός* and the *γερόμενος*, the Catholic and the alleged Epistles, give color to the opinion, that the expression *καθολικὴ ἐπιστολή* denoted a work universally acknowledged to be genuine, in contradistinction from one merely alleged or doubtful. A very respectable scholar has drawn this inference from the expressions of the two fathers just mentioned, and confirmed it by the following language of Eusebius. "The first Epistle of Peter," says he, "is universally acknowledged; but the Acts of Peter, his Gospel, his Sermon and Apocalypse, are not among the Catholic writings."<sup>2</sup>

Thus (it is said), Catholic and universally-received, *καθολικός* and *ὁμολογουμένος*, and, of course, not Catholic and doubtful, were, according to Eusebius, equivalent. At first view it would seem that nothing can be more correct; and yet this is far from being the idea which Eusebius attached to the word *καθολικός*.

He speaks elsewhere in a directly contrary manner. Of Clement of Alexandria, he says: "He used also the *disputed books*, viz. the Epistle of Jude and the other Catholic Epistles."<sup>3</sup> Still more plain is his language in an earlier passage, where he declares that the Epistle of James, one of the so-called *Catholic* Epistles, is to be regarded as *spurious*, as well as the pretended one of Jude, which, too, was one of the seven *Catholic* Epistles.<sup>4</sup> Thus, in his mind, Catholic was so far from being the opposite of suspicious or disputed, that it was applied to many of the writings classed as disputed.

Nor is it so certain that in Dionysius any contrast is intended between *καθολικός* and *γερόμενος*. He presents doubts in regard to the Apocalypse, and, among other things, objects that in it (1: 1) John calls himself by name, which is not once the case in his other writings. He proves this by a successive comparison of them. In his Gospel he conceals his name; the Catholic Epistle he opens with the words: 'That which we have heard, seen, etc. In the supposititious Epistles (he proceeds, after some intervening sentences), he merely calls himself the elder.'<sup>5</sup>

Jerm. Tom. IX. p. 181 Tom. III. Opp. Ed. Ruei. Tom. II. in Joann. p. 76. Tom. XX. in Jo. p. 323. Tom. IV. Opp. Ruei).

<sup>1</sup> Næsselt, Conject. ad Hist. Ep. Jacobi, appended to Knapp's Dissert. in C. II. Jacobi.

<sup>2</sup> H. E. III. 3.

<sup>3</sup> H. E. VI. 14.

<sup>4</sup> H. E. III. 23. Τοιαῦτα καὶ τὰ κατὰ τὸν Ἰάκωβον, οὗ ἡ πρώτη τῶν ὀνομαζομένων καθολικῶν ἐπιστολῶν εἶναι λέγεται. Ἰστίον δὲ, ὡς νοθεύεται μὲν . . . ὡς . . . Ἰούδα, μιᾶς καὶ αὐτῆς οὐσῆς τῶν ἑπτὰ λεγομένων καθολικῶν κ. τ. λ.

<sup>5</sup> Euseb. H. E. L. VII. c. 25. Ὁ μὲν γὰρ εὐαγγελιστὴς οὐδαμοῦ τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ προσγράφει, οὐδὲ κηρύσσει ἑαυτὸν, οὔτε διὰ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου, οἷτε διὰ τῆς ἐπιστολῆς . . . Ὁ δὲ εὐαγγελιστὴς οὐδὲ τῆς καθολικῆς ἐπιστολῆς προέγραψεν αὐτοῖς τὸ ὄνομα· ἀλλὰ ἀπερίττως ἀπ' αὐτοῦ τὸ μυστήριον τῆς θείας ἀποκαλύψεως ἤρξατο. Ὁ ἦν ἀπ' ἀρχῆς, ὃ ἀκηρόαμεν, ὃ ἐωράκαμεν τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς ἡμῶν. Ἐπὶ ταύτῃ τῇ ἀποκαλύψει καὶ ὁ κύριος τὸν Πέτρον ἐμακάρισεν, εἰπών· Μακάριος εἶ, Σίμων βῆρ Ἰωανᾶ, ὅτι σὰρξ καὶ αἷμα οὐκ ἄ-

The matter in hand here is the contrast of all John's works with the Apocalypse; but the writer's object and the connexion did not require that in the contrast these works should all be arranged in order one after another. It was sufficient that every one was cited under a certain title; this was all that was needful to support the idea which he advanced.

What he says of the Catholic and the supposititious Epistles respectively, moreover, is too far dissevered by an intervening thought. In exhibiting a contrast, we cannot by long parentheses remove the things we are comparing to a distance from each other, without destroying the intended effect. Thus, guided by the laws of grammar, we cannot perceive any intention of an antithesis.

But were it even admitted that Dionysius used *γερόμενος* in opposition to *καθολικός*, it would be only his own phraseology, and not that of the Christian church generally, and it is on this last that the question, what the title *καθολικαὶ ἐπιστολαί* in the biblical Codex signifies, must depend.

Eusebius expressly terms the first Epistle of John, which was of the class of the universally-admitted writings of the New Testament, *τὴν γερομένην Ἰωάννου προτέραν*, where *γερομένην* certainly does not stand opposed to *καθολικός* in signification.<sup>1</sup> The ancients have never applied the epithet Catholic to any other admitted and undoubted books of the New Testament, which they certainly must have done, had it signified universally-acknowledged. They have never applied this term to the Gospel, to the Acts, or the thirteen Epistles of Paul, although it would have been peculiarly appropriate.

It is, therefore, a technical expression for a class of biblical writings to which it belongs exclusively of all others, viz. for the class which comprises the didactic writings of all the apostles (Paul excepted) together, *καθολικῶς*, i. e. *καθόλου καὶ συλλήβδην*.

When the Gospels and Acts had been constituted one division, and the works of Paul another, there yet remained the writings of various authors to compose a third division, to which some name must be given. It was most appropriate to call it the common collection, *καθολικὸν σύνταγμα* of the apostles, and the writings which it comprised, *κοινάς* and *καθολικάς*, which were often synonymous words with the Greeks.

We find proof of this in the most ancient patristical phraseology. Clement of Alexandria calls the Epistle which was despatched by the council of the apostles (Acts 15: 23), *the Catholic Epistle, in which all the apostles had a share*, *τὴν ἐπιστολὴν καθολικὴν τῶν ἀποστόλων ἀπάντων*.<sup>2</sup> In this manner the seven Epistles under consideration are Catholic Epistles, or Epistles of all the apostles who were authors.

Such is the meaning, too, of the passage above quoted from Eusebius, who appeared to contradistinguish Catholic and doubtful; for his other language shows that this cannot be his intention. "The first Epistle

πεκάλυψέ σοι, ἀλλ' ὁ πατήρ μου ὁ οὐράνιος. Ἀλλ' οὐδὲ ἐν τῇ δευτέρᾳ γερομένη Ἰωάννου καὶ τρίτῃ καίτοι βραχείαις οὔσαις ἐπιστολαῖς Ἰωάννης ὀνομαστὶ πρόκειται.

<sup>1</sup> Euseb. H. E. L. III. c. 25.

<sup>2</sup> L. IV. Strom. c. 15. p. 512. Heins. et Sylb.



of Peter," he says, "is universally acknowledged, but the Acts of Peter, his Gospel, his Sermon and Apocalypse, are not of the number of the Catholic writings." He thus designates the class to which these alleged writings of Peter must have been referred (since the collection of historical and Pauline writings was closed), had they been considered as genuine and as belonging to the Canon—viz., in his opinion, the one in which were placed the writings of the apostles generally.

In the same way, too, Origen used the expression, when he applied it to the Epistle of Barnabas, *γέγραπται δὲ ἐν τῇ Βαρνάβα καθολικῇ ἐπιστολῇ*.<sup>1</sup> For this father is sometimes mentioned by the ancients under the title *ἀπόστολος*; in this view, the Epistle belonged to the common collection of the apostles, or among the writings of various authors.

But (a celebrated scholar objects), as in fact only two Epistles, the 1st of Peter and John, were acknowledged, how can the expression *καθολικός* have denoted a class? how could two writings be regarded as a *καθολικὸν σύνταγμα*? There was such a collection, however, and, according to the repeated declarations of Eusebius, all the other Epistles were contained in the Codex of the New Testament, and, though individuals may have doubted in regard to them, were publicly read in most churches. It is on this fact that my idea is founded (and this scholar himself seems to acknowledge it afterwards), and certainly it is tenable only on this condition.<sup>2</sup>

In the fourth century, however, another signification supplanted this. Heretics were constantly increasing in number, and the principal argument against them at this time was the long-established *locus communis* of a harmonious universal church, from which they were renegades and schismatics. The church and doctrines thus identical throughout the world were called *καθολικαί*. This signification, likewise, came to be given to the word as designating a class of the biblical books, and by the Catholic Epistles were meant such as were not directed to particular churches, but to the church universal, or a large part of it, nearly the same with circular letters, such as some of the Catholic Epistles, properly so called, really were. This is Theodoret's explanation of the word, and it was adopted by subsequent commentators.<sup>3</sup>

## § 152.

Before the fourth century, in which, for the first time an undeviating unanimity in all the churches in respect to the Canon was effected, Christian writers with perfect freedom advocated or denied the authority of certain writings of the New Testament. Individual fathers admitted or rejected certain books, according as their judgment dictated. Besides the Epistle to the Hebrews and the Apocalypse, this was the

<sup>1</sup> Orig. Contra Cels. L. I. n. 63.

<sup>2</sup> Pott. Epist. Cath. Fascic. I. exhibens Epistolam Jacobi. Proleg. p. 26, 27. 2d Ed.

<sup>3</sup> Pott. Ep. Cath. Vol. I. Excurs. I. De voce Ep. Cath. p. 178. See Schol. in Jac. Ep. Edit. N. T. F. Matthæi. The Scholiast on the Parisian Ms. No. 705 says: *Προτέτακται ἡ Ἰακώβου ἐπιστολὴ τῶν ἄλλων . . . ὅτι τῆς Πέτρου καθολικωτέρα, ταῖς γὰρ ἀνὰ πᾶσαν τὴν γῆν διεσπαρμέναις ἐγράφη δώδεκα φυλαῖς.*



case, as is well known, in regard to several of the Catholic Epistles, viz. that of James, the 2d and 3d of John, the 2d of Peter, and that of Jude.

They were, indeed, always circulated under the names of these authors, and by established custom were subjoined to the other biblical books; but they had not universally the estimation which was conceded to the latter, because they were not, equally with them, attested by vouchers and indisputable historical evidence, or because they contained internal grounds of suspicion.

Eusebius exhibits the prevalent opinion in regard to them in a passage which we have already frequently cited. It is in the 2d book and 23d chapter of his History: "The first of the so-called Catholic Epistles, that of James, is likewise considered spurious; for few of the ancients have mentioned it. So, too, with the Epistle of Jude, which is also one of the Catholic Epistles. It is well known, however, that in most churches these Epistles are made use of, equally with the other Scriptures."

Prescription and usage, therefore, in very many churches, *ἐν πλείστοις ἐκκλησίαις*, were in their favor; but those who required other reasons than prescription and custom were not restrained by these from deciding against them. The right of possession did not satisfy them; they were desirous of examining the title, and to establish this they required the evidence of former times and earlier fathers. If this was wanting, they took the liberty of forming their own opinion, of doubting or rejecting, according to their own critical judgment. Many others were found to concur with them.

They felt, almost as much as we ourselves, the want of historical vouchers, and drew a negative argument from the silence of antiquity, as we do; but, as we learn from the statement of Eusebius, they had no positive argument from history against these writings. How, indeed, could they have been assigned a place among the doubtful books, if credible witnesses of the early times of Christianity had flatly contradicted their pretended apostolic origin? or if others had remarked the time at which they became known, and the period of their first appearance, as being later than the times of the apostles, and had pointed out the place and persons where and by whom they had been put into circulation?

We have, consequently, nothing to apprehend in regard to them from this quarter. In fact their immemorial use by many Christian churches speaks in their favor, the right of possession being only now and then disputed because it was supported by comparatively few or weak documents.

Even the negative argument loses much of its force in regard to some of these Catholic Epistles, when we consider their character. Their brevity did not afford the ancients such an abundance of ideas for every species of composition, or such a number of arguments in behalf of their doctrinal and moral positions, as the Epistles to the Romans and Corinthians, or any other large book. And yet it was only for such purposes that the ancient fathers could make use of them, and thus attest their existence and genuineness. For it was not till a later period, when there existed what might be called a Christian literature, that the

literary history of Christianity, its various writers, and their works began to be subjects of investigation. The most ancient writings are admonitions of a moral nature, apologies, or controversial works, such as were called for by the exigencies of the time. It was not till long after, that the fathers were at leisure to turn their attention to the history of their religion, its fortunes, its literary productions, and the great men who had earned merit in its behalf. Circumstances and the necessity of polemical works put the public in possession of a history of the heretics and their sect by Justin and Irenæus, even before the birth of Hegesippus, the first historian of the Christian church. Now, as no one entered expressly into an investigation respecting the writers of earlier times their works, the question which were genuine and which suspicious, or respecting their history, it wholly depended on chance whether an ancient writing was mentioned in an author's productions or not, and this chance was the less favorable to the short Epistles, in proportion to the smallness of their compass and contents.

The negative argument was, moreover, usually enforced by internal reasons drawn from higher criticism, which was often applied at Alexandria in no discreditable manner. But this cannot curtail our right to examine and judge for ourselves. In such investigations personal authority is of no weight with the critic.

Higher criticism is still open to us likewise ; and I even entertain the hope of drawing from it manifest proofs of the genuineness of some of these Epistles, particularly those of James and Jude and the 2d of Peter.

This is the place to present the history of the two disputed Epistles of John, the occasion, purpose, and contents of which have been treated of already.

### § 153.

#### THE SECOND AND THIRD EPISTLES OF JOHN.

In behalf of these I must appeal first to the long established right of admission into the Codex of the New Testament, which they possessed in many churches. This is a proper preface to the testimonies in their favor, which we shall divide into the Greek, the eastern, and the western.

In the latter half of the second century, Clement of Alexandria alludes to several Epistles of John, but so indefinitely, that we cannot tell how many he had in mind. He refers to a passage in the first (1 John 5: 16), and calls it the *larger* Epistle ; from which we can merely infer that this was not the only one with which he was acquainted, without being able to determine whether he knew of only one or of two which were smaller.<sup>1</sup>

Origen, his successor in the ministry, is more express on this point. "John left behind him," he says, "an Epistle of a very few *stichoi* ; perhaps, also, a second and third ; though some do not consider these

<sup>1</sup> Φαίνεται δὲ Ἰωάννης ἐν τῇ μετ' αὐτοῦ ἐπιστολῇ τὰς διαφορὰς τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ἐκδιδάσκον ἐν τούτοις. Ἐάν τις ἴδῃ τὸν ἀδελφόν, κ. τ. λ. (L. II. Strom. c. 15).

genuine. Both these together, however, contain only an hundred *stichoi*.”<sup>1</sup>

Dionysius is the third father of the Alexandrian school who gives us information in regard to the Epistles of John. We have before seen that he was acquainted with all of them, but calls the two last *γερόμεναι*, writings alleged to be genuine. He was the first who attributed the Apocalypse to another John, a Presbyter of Ephesus, with whom Papias was intimately acquainted. Others extended this supposition still further, and ascribed these two Epistles, likewise, to the Presbyter.

The father of ecclesiastical history makes an allusion to this fact: “The second and third Epistles of John, whoever may be their author, the Evangelist or another man of the same name, ranks among the disputed books.”<sup>2</sup>

The Syriac church had them in their most ancient version, in which, as we have shown before, they were not refused a place till a later period. From this version Ephræm became acquainted with them, and he has sometimes cited them with express mention of their author.<sup>3</sup>

In the west we have a very important voucher for the 2d Epistle, who, on account of the place where he resided during his youth and the school in which he was educated, deserves especial regard as a witness in respect to the works of John. We mean Irenæus, who refers to the second Epistle under the writer’s name, and with a predicate which distinguishes him completely. “John, the disciple of our Lord,” *ὁ τοῦ κυρίου μαθητής*. This is the mode in which he invariably designates the Evangelist, in speaking of him or his works.<sup>4</sup>

He refers to it, likewise, in another place. After giving extracts from the first Epistle, he continues: “And John, the disciple of Jesus, in the Epistle before-mentioned, commanded that they (the heretics) should be shunned, saying,” etc. He then repeats, word for word, the 7th and 8th verses of the 2d Epistle.<sup>5</sup>

Hence, unless his memory was very inaccurate, he regarded the 2d Epistle as an appendix to the first, as a part of the *epistola prædicta*, just as we ourselves have considered it to be a supplement, composed and sent at the same time with the first. If this was the case, the following testimony takes a different aspect from that in which it appears at first view.

The anonymous author of the fragment in Muratori, who is usually

<sup>1</sup> Comm. in Matth. L. I. apud Euseb. H. E. VI. 25. *Καταλείπετε δὲ καὶ ἐπιστολὴν πᾶν ὀλίγων στίχων*. “Ἐστὼ δὲ καὶ δευτέραν καὶ τρίτην· ἐπεὶ οὐ πάντες φασὶ γνησίους εἶναι ταύτας. Πλὴν οὐκ εἰσὶ στίχων ἀμφοτέραι ἑκατόν.

<sup>2</sup> *Τῶν ἀντιλεγόμενων . . . ἡ ὀνομαζομένη δευτέρα καὶ τρίτη Ἰωάννου, εἴτε τοῦ εὐαγγελιστοῦ τυγχάνουσαι, εἴτε ἑτέρου ὁμωνύμου ἐκείνου* (H. E. III. 25).

<sup>3</sup> Hassencamp, “Anmerk. über die letzten §§ der Einleit. von Michaelis, p. 40—42.

<sup>4</sup> L. I. Adv. Hær. c. 16. The passage exists in both Greek and Latin: “*Joannes enim Domini discipulus superextendit damnationem in eos, neque ave a nobis eis dici volens: ‘Qui enim dicit,’ inquit, ave . . . etc.*”.

<sup>5</sup> L. III. 16. n. 8. “*Et discipulus ejus Joannes in prædictâ Epistolâ fugere eos præcepit dicens: Multi seductores exierunt in hunc mundum, qui non confitentur Jesum Christum in carne venisse. Hic est seductor et antichristus. Videte eos, ne perdati, quod operati estis,*” etc.



supposed to have been Caius the Presbyter, names two Epistles of John in his catalogue of the sacred books.<sup>1</sup>

In the Carthaginian council under Cyprian, Aurelius, bishop of Chullabi, gave his opinion in the words of John 2 Ep. v. 10, expressly referring to the apostle of this name.<sup>2</sup>

Still, there were some in the Latin church, who were inclined to attribute the two lesser Epistles to that John, who had been supposed by Dionysius to be the author of the Apocalypse, like those before mentioned among the Greeks, from whom this idea was borrowed.<sup>3</sup>

If, now, we sum up our authentic arguments for the genuineness of these two Epistles, we shall find that there are far more numerous and weighty authorities in favor of the 2d than of the 3d. That of Irenæus seems even decisive of the genuineness of the former, while no clear mention is made of the latter before the third century, to which it was indeed transmitted under the name of John, yet not accompanied with such evidence as was universally satisfactory.<sup>4</sup>

### § 154.

Both, however, contain strong internal evidence that they were written by the apostle. We have already seen how harmoniously they rank with the other works of John, how perfectly they suit his fortunes and personal condition, and how accurately the unobtrusive and unlabored circumstantiality of the few lines which they comprise applies to him throughout. Nought here is detached, nothing is without connexion and isolated, or, at all events, contradictory, as is the case with fictitious writings. Nothing is incompatible with the intimations of antiquity, and nothing said generally, indefinitely, without any particular reference, as happens in the case of writers who assume the person of another, without being able to transfer themselves in imagination into his condition and circumstances. The contrary of all this is true, and there appears throughout the most beautiful consistency in point of fact with a remarkable situation in the apostle's life.

We find, too, predominating in them, the same simple, unaffected language, which we meet with in the 1st Epistle. The character, also,

<sup>1</sup> "Epistolæ sane Judæ et superscripti Joannis dum in Catholica habentur" (Murat. Antiqq. Ital. Med. Æv. T. III. p. 854.).

<sup>2</sup> Opp. Cypr. Edit. juxta Baluz. Venet. p. 711. "Item alius Aurelius a Chullabi dixit: Joannes apostolus in Epistolâ suâ posuit dicens: Si quis ad vos venit, et doctrinam Christi non habet, nolite eum admittere in domum vestram, et ave illi ne dixeritis, qui enim" . . . etc.

<sup>3</sup> Hieronym. in Catal. V. Joannes.

<sup>4</sup> The disputed verse 1 John 5: 7 is too inconsiderable a part of the New Testament to merit a prolix discussion in an Introduction. Its examination belongs to a critical edition of the New Testament, which is responsible for every variation in the text. The latest defence of it is by W. F. Hetzel, in the "Schriftforscher," II. Bd. p. 2. Horstig (in Henke's "Magazin für Religionsphilosophie and Exegese," II Bd. p. 1), has presented some counter-arguments. So, particularly, Griesbach, in his "Bemerkungen über Hetzels Vertheidigung der Echtheit der Stelle, 1 John 5: 7." Giessen 1794. Griesbach appeared to me to have exhausted the subject; but a short time since this question came under examination anew in England. As I am but generally acquainted with these discussions, it is not proper for me to express any opinion of them.



is the same ; a benevolent heart, alive to all the finer feelings, yet zealous, and evincing a severity and hostile vehemence against those who fomented disturbances, hardly to be expected from the preacher of love ; who, however, once wished to call down fire from heaven, when his friend and master was ill-treated.

This indignation kept pace, in its increase, with the attempts of the deceivers, their arrogance and mischief. His first and second Epistles warn against them, their doctrines, and intercourse with them, earnestly, indeed, but not vehemently ; he advises the deaconess, or whoever the benevolent lady was that freely practised Christian hospitality, not to receive them, and to withhold the salutation with which a believer was welcomed and entertained as a *συνχριστιανός*. But the third is more vehement, because the matter had come to an open rupture, to a manifestation of contempt for the apostle and his messengers. He threatens that *he will remember their evil deeds*, which he describes with feeling, and evidently with a heart wounded by personality. Every thing is as it must have happened from the state of things, the gradation of offences, and their closer and closer personal bearing upon the author. Yet we do not see that violent anger, which attacks its adversary with bold energy, or bitter and passionate eloquence ; nor the resolute and stern severity of Paul, which draws the character of its enemies in accurate outline, and rebukes them in exuberant language. We see the indignation of a sensitive and excited mind, which is rather inclined to pour fourth complaints than to make accusations and sustain them with energy, but which, nevertheless, has too much vigor to be content with a quiet and patient concealment of its feelings within itself.

It must indeed be admitted, that there are not very many of the ancients who mention the 2d Epistle, and few who mention the 3d ; but the 2d is extremely short, and had not the expression, *ave ne dixeris*, rather striking than really violent, been so well suited to the purpose of controversy, we should have had yet fewer testimonies in its favor. The 3d, however, has this additional peculiarity, that its object is not the explanation or inculcation of certain doctrines or principles of moral conduct, and thus it is not a writing for general Christian instruction, but rather relates to the private affairs of the apostle. It did not, therefore, afford the ancients any aid in instruction or controversy, and this has necessarily caused a dearth of evidence for it in their works.

### § 155.

#### THE EPISTLE OF JAMES.

In what country was this Epistle written ? The natural objects which encompassed the writer, the allusions to climate which appear in the Epistle, must guide us in answering this question. The descriptive portions of it, the sensuous images by means of which he presents his ideas, exhibit to us the landscape and the appearances of nature under the influence of which he thought, and from which his fancy acquired her materials. Communication and description are not like invention, but proceed from materials already at hand ; and frequently, while the

author is not himself clearly sensible of it, and perhaps contrary to his intention, they betray the scenes and objects with which he is most familiar, and which he regarded as most popular and forcible for the purpose of exhibiting his ideas to others or exciting in them his own feelings. In this way our author clearly discloses the country in which he lived, without intending to do it, though without wishing to conceal it.

His native land was situated not far from the sea (James 1: 6. 3: 4), and was blessed with valuable productions, such as figs, oil, and wine (3: 12). These features, however, are rather general, and leave us the choice of several countries of the old world. Thus (e. g.) Sophocles (*Œd. Colon.* 16) describes the province of Attica :

*Χῶρος δ' ὅδ' ἱερὸς, ὡς σάφ' εἰκόσαι, βρύων  
Δάφνης, ἐλαίας, ἀμπέλου. . . .*

Springs of saline and bitter water were familiar to the author (3: 11, 12). This is a somewhat more definite circumstance. It does not suit so many countries, applying in particular to Palestine, where they were very frequent, as is observed by Josephus in many places, and also by all those travellers who have remarked on the physical condition of the country.

The land, moreover, was very much exposed to drought, and there was frequently reason to fear a scarcity of productions for want of rain (5: 17, 18); and, in particular, sudden devastations of the vegetable kingdom were occasioned by the *ἄνεμος καίσων*, or *ערק* (1: 11). We have sufficient knowledge respecting this wind, and the climate to which it belongs. The name under which it appears here was current not only in western Asia generally, but particularly in Palestine. Another phenomenon which presented itself to the author's notice determines in favor of the same residence; we mean the early and latter rains, which took place respectively in seed time and in March, and on which the fruitfulness of the season depended. He calls them in technical language, *יֵרֶק* and *בִּלְקִישׁ* or *πρώιμος καὶ ὕψιμος* (5: 7), as they were termed in Palestine.

From this country, therefore, he wrote to all the Jews dispersed in foreign countries and states, to the twelve tribes which were scattered abroad, *ἐν τῇ διασπορᾷ* (1: 1).

## § 156.

The Jewish people scattered abroad through the whole world were separated into three principal divisions, viz. the residents in the mother country and the Holy City, which was the central point of union, and two *διασποραί*, the *διασπορὰ Ἀσίας*, with its capital, Babylon (1 Pet. 1: 1), and the *διασπορὰ Ἑλλήνων* (John 7: 35), which seems to have regarded Alexandria as its capital, on account of the language spoken by it.

It was from the mother country and the religious authorities in the Holy City that injunctions and arrangements relative to religion proceeded; e. g. in regard to the intercalation on which the time of Easter, Pentecost, and other festivals depended. From Jerusalem the ordinances were despatched to the *διασπορὰ* of Babylon, to that of Media,

and that of Greece.<sup>1</sup> The Median captivity was that of the ten tribes, and properly disconnected from the other tribes;<sup>2</sup> and hence the injunctions from Jerusalem may have concerned only such individuals of the kingdom of Judah as were scattered about in this country; and these were probably under the immediate direction of the religious authorities in Babylon.

The Babylonish Jews had a chief, who was called ראש הגלות or ראש גלותא, Prince of the exiles. Among the Alexandrians this officer bore the name Ἀραβάρχης, or Ἀλαβάρχης, about which much has been written.<sup>3</sup>

The other Jewish authorities in foreign countries derived their official power from the chief of the διασπορά.<sup>4</sup>

On this system, by which was effected the maintenance of a religious connexion through the whole nation, each chief, it is seen, had a separate sphere of command. General injunctions and commissions however, could go forth only from Jerusalem, the centre of religious authority.

Of this general nature is the Epistle of James, which is directed to all the tribes, wherever dispersed; it must, therefore, have been written from the Holy City by the head of the Christian Jews at Jerusalem.

### § 157.

What induced the writer to this step? what occasion or necessity called upon him to take it? In this Epistle the apostle Paul is (if I may be allowed to use so harsh an expression for a while) contradicted so flatly, that it would seem to have been written in opposition to some of his doctrines and positions. All that Paul has taught respecting faith, its efficacy in justification, and the inutility of works, is here directly contravened. It is not impossible that these two writers have crossed each other's paths and taken positions on this subject in opposition to one another, by mere accident, neither knowing of the other or being actuated by any intention of controversy.

Is nothing beyond accident, then, apparent here? Or is the contrariety so particular, that it cannot be ascribed to the operation of chance?

It is in the Epistles to the Romans and Hebrews that Paul has most fully expressed his opinion on this subject; and in the Epistle under consideration there appears such a special reference to these two Epistles, as cannot have been caused by accident. Many thoughts, even in the very same costume, the same phraseology and figurative turn, are borrowed from the Epistle to the Romans. At the commencement James says (1: 3); *Γινώσκοντες, ὅτι τὸ δοκίμιον ὑμῶν τῆς πίστεως*

<sup>1</sup> Gemar. Hierosol. on Sanhedrim in the Mischnah Cap. 1. Constit. 2da. בני גלותא דבבל בני גלותא דמדן בני גלותא דיוון. Comp. Gemar. Babyl. on the same passage in the Mischnah.

<sup>2</sup> Liber Siphra, on Levit. 26. 28. Parasch. אש בחוקותי c. VIII. sec. 1. אלא עשרה השבטים שגלו למדן.

<sup>3</sup> Joseph. Ant. L. XVIII. c. 8. L. XX. c. 5. n. 2. c. 7. n. 3. Cicero, Ep. ad Attic. L. II. Ep. 17. Juvenal, Sat. I. 130.

<sup>4</sup> Gemar. Babyl. in Tract. Sanhedr. c. 1. § 1. וכן אמר שמעאל לשקל רשותא ל. מביח דרש גלותא.

κατεργάζεται ὑπομονήν. This idea is likewise expressed by Paul: *Εἰδότες, ὅτι ἡ θλίψις ὑπομονήν κατεργάζεται, ἡ δὲ ὑπομονὴ δοκιμὴν* (Rom. 5: 3). The only difference is in the words *γινώσκοντες* and *εἰδότες*, both of which are participles, and, in the change of *δοκιμὴν* for *δοκίμιον*. James describes the propensity to evil under the figure of a war occasioned by the lusts in our members (4: 1): *Ἐκ τῶν ἡδονῶν ὑμῶν, τῶν στρατευομένων ἐν τοῖς μέλεσιν ὑμῶν*. The same thought and image are found in Rom. 7: 23. *Νόμον ἐν τοῖς μέλεσίν μου ἀντιστρατεύομενον τῷ νόμῳ τοῦ νοός μου*. The clause in James 4: 4, *Ὅτι ἡ φιλία τοῦ κόσμου ἔχθρα τοῦ θεοῦ*, is of the same character as: *Διότι τὸ φρόνημα τῆς σαρκὸς ἔχθρα εἰς θεόν* (Rom. 8: 7). Presumptuous judgment respecting others is reproved by both with the same rhetorical figure and the same phraseology: *σὺ τίς εἶ, ὃς κρίνεις τὸν ἕτερον* (James 4: 12); *σὺ τίς εἶ ὁ κρίνων ἀλλότριον οἰκέτην* (Rom. 14: 4), and there occurs in each a similar additional clause: *εἰς γὰρ . . . ὁ δυνάμενος σῶσαι—δυνατὸς γάρ ἐστιν ὁ θεὸς σῆσαι*.

Intentional opposition is still more evident in the mode of discussing the question concerning faith and works. Paul defends the preëminence of faith from the example of Abraham (Rom. 4: 1. Heb. 11, 8); while James maintains from the same example the superiority of works (James 2: 21). Paul cites in favor of his position the justification of the harlot Rahab (Heb. 11: 31); James, however, argues the contrary from her example (2: 25).

Not only, therefore, are their opinions opposite, but James controverts particular arguments presented by Paul. It is not surprising that both sought in the life of Abraham support for entirely different positions, since the father of the whole Jewish nation and the earliest depositary of the promises was an illustrious example of the divine providence, to which the most dissimilar writers might easily have recourse without mutual controversy or mutual concert; but the fact that both seek in a person so inconsiderable and so little praiseworthy as the harlot Rahab, an example and an argument in support of their opposite opinions, cannot be explained by saying that the preëminence and extreme interest belonging to the person might have attracted the attention of both, as has been remarked by an estimable scholar.<sup>1</sup>

But further, there is this peculiarity in respect to the example of Abraham, that each draws his argument for his position from the same event in Abraham's life and the same passage in the O. T.; and that in doing this both have used almost exactly the same phraseology: Rom. 4: 1, 2. *Τὴ ἐροῦμεν Ἀβραὰμ τὸν πατέρα ἡμῶν εὐρηκέναι . . . εἰ γὰρ Ἀβραὰμ ἐξ ἔργων ἐδικαιώθη*; James 2: 21. *Ἀβραὰμ ὁ πατὴρ ἡμῶν οὐκ ἐξ ἔργων ἐδικαιώθη*. They then appeal alike to the words of Gen. 15: 6. *Ἐπίστευσε Ἀβραὰμ τῷ θεῷ, καὶ ἐλογίσθη αὐτῷ εἰς δικαιοσύνην* (James 2: 23. Rom. 4: 3), Paul cites them thus: *τί ἡ γραφὴ λέγει*; James on the other hand: *καὶ ἐπληρώθη ἡ γραφὴ ἡ λέγουσα*.

As to the example of Rahab, too, by which, in the Epistle to the Hebrews (11: 31), Paul sustains the importance of faith, the brief manner in which it is treated by both writers exhibits a similarity more than accidental. The former designates Rahab by the epithet *ἡ πόρ-*

<sup>1</sup> Storr, "Dissert. de Ep. Cath. occasione et consilio." Tubing. 1789. § 5.



νη; so, too, the latter, *Ῥαῦβ ἡ πόρνη* (James 2: 25). Paul says, *δεξαμένη τοὺς κατασκόπους*, and James uses the same word in the same participial form: *ὑποδεξαμένη τοὺς ἀγγέλους*.

The contrariety, therefore, is not confined to the main topic, but extends to the particular arguments and the verbal presentation of them. Were it possible that they should by accident contravene each other thus in regard to the main topic, they could not accidentally coincide in their arguments in favor of their opposite opinions; for contradictory positions do not suggest the same arguments. It cannot, moreover, be by chance that they resemble each other so much in their modes of presenting their arguments.

The Epistle was therefore written of set purpose against Paul, against the doctrine that faith procures man justification and the divine favor. The first of the writings in which Paul advocates faith so warmly was intended primarily for the Jewish members of the church at Rome. We may be sure, however, that acquaintance with it was not long confined within this compass. The constant influx and efflux of foreigners into and from the metropolis of the world; the sympathy which occurrences relative to Christianity excited among its adherents; the interest that must have been felt by Jewish and Gentile converts in this Epistle, which stated such bold truths and maintained such peculiar positions—all together could not fail to extend this Epistle rapidly from the capitol of the kingdom throughout the rest of the world.

This commendation of faith in depreciation of works was susceptible in that day of all those misconstructions which afterwards arose from it and have been so zealously maintained among us; and, when Christianity was forming and establishing itself, it might give to its system a tendency that would frustrate the purposes which it was meant to subserve. The Epistle to the Romans had had sufficient time (four years) to be read and misunderstood, and to bring into vogue undesirable notions, when that to the Hebrews appeared, advocating in full the same opinions.

The Epistle to the Hebrews was written to Palestine, i. e. to the very country in which the author of the alleged Epistle of James was brought up and educated, and where he still lived. He might then easily perceive the impressions which it made, the erroneous sentiments to which it gave rise, and the injury which practical, active Christianity, the religion of works, must experience from it. We can, therefore, easily comprehend why he stepped forward to give his brethren a written warning not to be misled and to keep steadfastly before their eyes the principles of Christian conduct.

### § 158.

Who, now, was its author? He calls himself James; but the Bible mentions two or three of that name, qualified by their rank and calling to instruct mankind, and endued with authority for that purpose.

There was a James, the son of Zebedee (Matth. 4: 21. Mark 3: 17. Luke 6: 14. Acts 1: 13). He died, however, as early as the time of the elder Agrippa, when Paul had just commenced his career (Acts 12: 2 seq.). He, therefore, cannot have been the author.

Besides him, there was a James the son of Alphaeus (Matth. 10: 3.

27: 56. Mark 3: 18. 15: 40. Luke 6: 15. Acts 1: 13). There is a James mentioned in Matth. 13: 55. Mark 6: 3. Galat. 1: 19, and called a brother of our Lord.

Many distinguish between the brother of our Lord and James the son of Alpheus, the apostle.<sup>1</sup> In order to determine who was the author of this Epistle, which it is our duty to attempt doing, we must inform ourselves concerning all the persons of the name of James, who are represented in the bible to have been endued with authority as teachers.

James the brother of our Lord, and James the son of Alpheus, in my opinion, are the same. The following are my reasons.

The brethren of our Lord were James, Josés, Simon, and Judas (Matth. 13: 55). In the catalogues given of the apostles we find, along with James, the son of Zebedee, three of these same names, viz. James, Simon, and Judas (Luke 6: 15. Acts 1: 18. Matth. 10: 3).

If we look at Mark we find the same names presented in a manner which corroborates our opinion. Matthew mentions the apostles in the following order, James, Judas, Simon (10: 3, 4), and the brethren of Jesus in a different one, James, Simon, Judas (13: 55). Mark, not satisfied with this disposition of them, made an alteration, and arranged the brethren of Jesus precisely as the apostles of this name succeeded each other, viz. James, Judas, Simon (Mark 3: 18. 6: 3), as if he was desirous of showing, not only the sameness of the names, but a real identity.

The name of the father of the three apostles, and that of the father of our Lord's brethren are so similar as to confer additional probability on our supposition. The apostles were the sons of Alpheus, and the brethren of our Lord the sons of Cleopas.

The Mary who is called by Matthew (27: 56), *the mother of Jesus' brethren*, is called by John in the parallel passage, *Mary the wife of Cleophas* (19: 25). For there was no other Mary, with the exception of Mary Magdalene, present at the passion and death of our Lord. Matthew excludes every other by speaking of Mary Magdalene and *the other Mary* (27: 61. 28: 1). *Μαρία ἡ Μαγδαληνή, καὶ ἡ ἄλλη Μαρία*. John, then, must have meant by Mary, the wife of Cleophas, the mother of Jesus' brethren, and Mary the wife of Alpheus and Mary the wife of Cleophas are one and the same.

יֵשׁוּעַ would be written in the Galilean dialect—יֵשׁוּעַ—Κλωπᾶ, and with the Greek form would become Ἀλφαῖος, as Ἀγγαῖος from ἄγγι.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> The dispute in regard to these persons named James has been handed down from the earliest times. The opinion and arguments of those who suppose two besides James the son of Zebedee, viz. James the less and the brother of our Lord, are presented in detail by Pott (Epist. Cath. Perp. Annot. Illust. Vol. I. Prol. p. 1—23); and the contrary opinion in the academic work "De Jacobo Epistolæ eidem adscriptæ auctore Scripsit Gabler. Altdorf. 1787. Comp. Eichhorn's "Allg. Bibl. der bibl. Litt." I. Bd. VI. St. p. 1011 seq. The work entitled "Briefe zweener Brüder Jesu in unserm Kanon. Lemgo, 1775," distinguishes two persons, but considers James the brother of Jesus as own brother to the other. On the whole, I concur with the opinion of Dr. Gabler. Much on this subject may be found in Michaelis' Einl. in das N. T. 4th ed. II. Th. § 238—241.

<sup>2</sup> The Cleopas mentioned in Luke 24: 18, has nothing to do with this subject. That name, as Dr. Gabler has rightly remarked, is a Greek one from Κλεό-

Thus, what we have inferred from a comparison of the Evangelists in regard to the fathers and mothers of these three men is here confirmed by the analogy of language; and the sons of Cleophas and the sons of Alphaeus are in fact the same persons.

Against this identity there is but a single objection of any moment; and this is that the brethren of Jesus did not believe on him, οὐδὲ γὰρ οἱ ἀδελφοὶ αὐτοῦ ἐπίστευον εἰς αὐτόν, as we are told by John (7: 5). How could these unbelievers have been received among the apostles?

But, besides that with John faith in Jesus signifies a great deal, no less than the acknowledgment of him as the Messiah, the Son of God, in regard to which they might have hesitated without refusing belief in his doctrines or in his qualifications as a prophet—besides this, James, Simon, and Judas, are really last in the list of the apostles, Judas Iscariot alone being placed after them. There is, then, additional reason for supposing the three apostles to have been the same with the three brethren of Jesus of the same name, who were so slow of belief.

If we follow the persons of the name of James still further, during the time when after the death of our Lord they appear engaged in the duties to which they were called, we shall find the biblical history to import that there was but one James besides the son of Zebedee who was beheaded.

Not long after the latter was beheaded (Acts 12: 2), when Peter had been liberated from prison, where a similar or more cruel fate awaited him, and had escaped from Jerusalem in the night, he directed that the news should be carried to *James* and the other brethren (Acts 12: 17). He speaks as though there was now but one James; using no epithet or sign of distinction, precisely as if there could be no confounding of persons. We know from another narrative that this James was the brother of our Lord (Gal. 1: 19).

When Paul and Barnabas proposed the question concerning the observance of the law in the council at Jerusalem, the rest of the council being silent, *James* answered, saying—and the matter was decided (Acts 15: 13). The representation of this occurrence, too, is precisely as if there was but one of this name, and the person could not possibly be mistaken.

When Paul subsequently appeared again at Jerusalem (Acts 21: 18), the day after his arrival he introduced his companions into the house of James, in which all the elders were assembled. Among those thus introduced was the historian himself (εἰσῆει ὁ Παῦλος σὺν ἡμῖν πρὸς Ἰάκωβον), who here, as in every other case in the Acts, speaks as if there was but one James possessed of ministerial authority, and he, therefore, needed no special mark of distinction.

Paul, too, proceeds in a similar way, when relating in the Epistle to the Galatians some of the circumstances of his life after his conversion.

When he came to Jerusalem the first time after his conversion, he abode some days with Peter; "but other of the apostles," he contin-

---

πατρος, like Ἀντιπᾶς from Ἀντίπατρος, Ἀρποκράτης from Ἀρποκράτης. His wife was not present at the occurrence. He says only in general, γυναῖκες τινές (v. 22), without affirming any closer participation in the scene by himself or his family.



ues, "saw I none, save James, the Lord's brother" (1: 19).<sup>1</sup> In this case he added a distinctive designation to James' name, because the other James, the son of Zebedee and brother of John, was still living at the time of which he spoke (Comp. Acts, § 78), and hence a mistake would have been possible without it.

The latter died soon after, and henceforward no allusion is made to more than one James in Paul's narrative. Peter escaped from the Holy City, and went, it seems, to Antioch. There he ate with the Gentiles, till certain came from James, *πρὸ τοῦ γὰρ ἐλθεῖν τινὰς ἀπὸ Ἰακώβου* (Gal. 2: 12).

On occasion of the second mission, James (the name is used without any mark of distinction) was a prominent pillar of the Christian cause in Jerusalem, as well as Peter and John (Gal. 2: 9), he being represented, however, as the first of the three.

Thus, as at the commencement of Paul's narrative we found this same James designated by Paul as the brother of our Lord, and have observed that he continued to remain constantly at Jerusalem, so now we find him there after a considerable lapse of time. We find the same person, moreover, termed in other historical accounts the brother of our Lord. Hegesippus tells us concerning this James, the brother of our Lord, that he was the head of the church at Jerusalem, and had become generally known under the surname of the Just.<sup>2</sup> Clement, in the 6th book of his Hypotyposes, confirms both these facts; and, according to Jerome, he was head of the church in the Holy City for about thirty years.<sup>3</sup>

### § 159.

Supposing, however, that there was more than one James, which of them was the author of the Epistle? It must have been the James who was head of the church at Jerusalem, even if we assume another beside him wholly unknown to fame. He alone could expect that his name would procure attention and his authority be respected wherever Jews were to be found over the whole earth.

<sup>1</sup> *Ἐτερον δὲ τῶν ἀποστόλων οὐκ εἶδον, εἰ μὴ Ἰάκωβον, τὸν ἀδελφὸν τοῦ κυρίου.* This passage ranks the brother of our Lord among the apostles; and hence there remains no reason for distinguishing between the apostle and the brother of our Lord of the same name. But those who take delight in supposing a great many persons of the name of James, assert contrariwise the possibility of another interpretation of it. It may, they think, be understood as meaning: I saw no other apostle, *but only* James the brother of our Lord. But were this the meaning, it would be very badly expressed; and *ἀλλὰ μόνον* should have been used instead of *εἰ μὴ*, as it is frequently in Paul's writings. According to Paul's *usus loquendi*, *εἰ μὴ*, if it follows a general clause, denotes an exception. 1 Cor. 2: 11. *Οὐδεὶς οἶδεν—εἰ μὴ τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ θεοῦ.* 1 Cor. 8: 4. *Ὅτι οὐδεὶς θεὸς ἕτερος, εἰ μὴ εἰς.* 2 Cor. 12: 5. *Τίτῳ ἐμαντοῦ οὐ καυχῆσομαι—εἰ μὴ ἐν ταῖς ἀσθενείαις μου.* Consequently the passage under consideration signifies: I saw no other of the apostles but James the brother of our Lord. The first clause is not to be taken as exclusive, the latter denoting an exception.

<sup>2</sup> Euseb. H. E. II. 23.

<sup>3</sup> Euseb. H. E. II. 1. Hieronym. Catal. voc. Jacobus.



He only, moreover, by virtue of the station which he held as head of the church in the Holy City itself, possessed an established right to address all the Jewish Christians in the world as an œcumenical teacher. He enjoyed among the Christian Jews that prerogative which was always accorded to the religious head of the Jews at Jerusalem, of exercising superintendence over all the Jews scattered abroad, and supreme religious authority generally; and this could be assumed by no other teacher. The chief of the Asiatic dispersion might watch over his provinces, over the *διασπορά Ἀσίας*, the chief of the Africano-European dispersion over the *διασπορά τῶν Ἑλλήνων*, the Jews who spoke Greek; but neither of them could presume to send forth epistles and injunctions to all the twelve tribes, to the Jews as a people. It was only from the perpetual centre of union for all the tribes and all their individual members, that commands and instructions could be dispensed to all.

This established organization of Judaism would have made it difficult to influence the minds of even the Jewish Christians generally, had not the person who undertook to do it corresponded with their habitual ideas of fitness, had he not been able to command respect and general obedience as head over the Christians in Jerusalem. Of all the persons named James, however, only the brother of our Lord, who was at Jerusalem, could in this view undertake the task with propriety and success.

If the apostle was a different person from the brother of our Lord, he cannot have been the author. For the author does not call himself *ἀπόστολος*, as he must in that case have done, in order to certify his authority as a teacher; for no one inferior to an apostle could have presumed to dispense decisions on religious subjects to the Jewish Christians generally.

He was the brother of our Lord. This was the distinguishing appellation by which one of the persons named James ranked above the apostles, and was the chief pillar of the faith at Jerusalem. He could not now apply this designation to himself, it is true; for our Lord was no longer the brother of mortal man. Exalted over all things, he had already entered upon the government of the world; and *ἀδελφός κυρίου* was now the same as *ἀδελφός θεός* or *θεῖος ἀδελφός*, a title to which James had not the arrogance to make pretension. The only choice remaining, therefore, was to take the designation of servant instead of brother, and to call himself, as he has done—*δοῦλος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ*.

## § 160.

Between several moral writings, composed in similar circumstances, in support of the same truths and the same positions, there will always be a striking difference, depending on the mental constitution of each author and his peculiar cast of feeling. The same divine truth meets with a different reception in different minds, is looked at more in one light than another, and felt more or less strongly, according to their character, assimilates itself to the ideas already existing in each, becomes intimately connected with those ideas, and naturalizes itself in the human understanding in different ways.

This Epistle, considering simply its strain of thought, without reference to its figures, phraseology, and style, has a peculiar character. It exhibits the forbearance, the lenity and the peculiar bent of mind, which, as history represents, belonged to James of Jerusalem.

James of Jerusalem treated the Jews with particular indulgence in respect to the obligatory nature of the law and its ceremonies. In the council of the apostles, it is true, he released the Gentiles from the observances of Judaism; but does not utter a word in contravention of their binding force upon the Jews. They might, if they were so inclined, learn from this how much of their religion was essential to a Christian, and if they were not, they certainly could not be offended (Acts 15: 13, 22). He even indulged them in their continued adherence to a distinction of meats (Gal. 2: 12, 13) and to the legal tenets in regard to pollution. He thus showed indirectly that the law might be dispensed with, and yet suffered it to be observed for a while longer, because many could not or would not dispense with it.

In a writing like this, insisting upon practical Christianity, upon the doctrines of Jesus as the highest moral law, the author must, one would think, have come out at once with the declaration that the precepts of Moses were no longer the standard of human actions and the Jewish usages no longer to be esteemed works of piety. But he proceeds in a totally different manner. He does not assail the favorite opinions of the Jews, but only places by their side invariably something better and more perfect, in the hope that the latter will of itself supplant the former. He, for the moment, fully adopts the law of Moses as the rule of human conduct (James 2: 8 and 11), and afterwards maintains merely that the new dispensation requires all this in a far higher degree (2: 12); he leaves to the former its importance as an institution of the Deity (4: 11), but recommends the Christian law as the most perfect and exalted (1: 25). The ceremonial rites of the Jews, *θρησκευτά*, do not offend him, even though some of them are trifling; he leaves them as they are, and only declares that the purest piety consists in works of inward morality (1: 26, 27). Can we not see James of Jerusalem in all this?

History<sup>1</sup> describes the brother of our Lord as a man of extraordinary strictness of life and principles, which strictness gained him the distinctive title of the Just, and made him, as it were, the Cato of the disciples of Jesus. This rigid austerity, not content with particular perfections, requiring of the virtuous man the fulfilment of the whole moral law, and demanding complete virtue without acknowledging individual excellences, is clearly portrayed in the Epistle. The author shows himself throughout disinclined to relax even in respect to the minutest moral requisitions, or to distinguish between the important and the unimportant.

According to history, James was a peculiarly ardent advocate of prayer,<sup>2</sup> and had an extremely warm belief in its benefit and efficacy. This trait, too, distinguishes our Epistle, for, though the Epistle is very far from being diffuse, prayer is nevertheless repeatedly and earnestly enjoined (1: 5—9. 4: 2, 3. 5: 16—19).

<sup>1</sup> Hegesipp. apud Euseb. H. E. L. II. c. 23.

<sup>2</sup> Hegesipp. loc. cit.

It is not, then, an ideal picture, sketched in general terms, indefinite, and without character; but it is the transcript of an individual, expressing a certain cast of thought and character. It is no fiction, but the portrait of a human mind, exhibiting a definiteness of feature that points to a real existence.

The character which it exhibits is one presented in history, that of James, who presided over the church at Jerusalem, and was called the brother of our Lord. We see, therefore, not only that the Epistle is a genuine work of a certain James in the first century of the Christian era, but to which of the several of this name (if there were several) it is to be attributed.

### § 161.

We come next in order to the testimonies of the ancients, and the accounts which sustain its genuineness and serve to elucidate its history.

The idea concerning faith and works which was deduced from the writings of Paul would certainly have become the general one, if some distinguished teacher had not interposed; but we find it to have been rather the case that the opinion of James was inculcated in a form which reconciled it with that of Paul. Hence the influence of this Epistle upon the early doctrinal system is undeniable, and it derives from this fact a very striking proof of its genuineness and the legislative authority of its author.

The doctrine of works and faith is discussed by Clement of Rome in his first Epistle to the church at Corinth. It is true he does not mention James by name, for the fathers of this period rarely quote the apostolic writings under the names of their authors; but the doctrine which he presents is clearly that of James, and indeed he exhibits striking resemblances to him in particular positions and arguments, and in respect to phraseology.

He speaks (C. 38) of the true wisdom which is evinced by works, nearly in the same way as James (3: 13). *Ὁ σοφὸς ἐνδεικνύσθω τὴν σοφίαν αὐτοῦ, μὴ ἐν λόγοις, ἀλλ' ἐν ἔργοις ἀγαθοῖς.*

In the 30th Chapter, he commences precisely in the words of James (4: 6). *Ὁ γὰρ θεὸς ὑπερηφάνοις ἀντιτάσσεται*, and after several clauses passes to the subject of *καταλαλία*, as James (4: 11) does (using the word *καταλαλεῖν*), and at the close presents James' opinion in regard to justification by practical Christianity (*ἔργοις δικαιούμενοι καὶ μὴ λόγοις*). *Θεὸς γὰρ ὑπερηφάνοις ἀντιτάσσεται, ταπεινοῖς δὲ δίδωσι χάριν. Κοληθῶμεν οὖν ἐκείνοις, οἷς ἡ χάρις ἀπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ δέδοται . . . ἐγκρατεῦμενοι, ἀπὸ παντὸς ψιθυρισμοῦ καὶ καταλαλίας πόρρω ἑαυτοὺς ποιοῦντες, ἔργοις δικαιούμενοι καὶ οὐ λόγοις.*

The example of Abraham and Rahab is treated by him, not as Paul treats it in his Epistle to the Hebrews, of which he often makes evident and literal use, but after the manner of James. He says (C. 10): *Ἀβραάμ, ὁ φίλος προσαγορευθεὶς* (he is thus called only in the Epistle of James), *πιστὸς εὐρέθη ἐν τῷ ὑπήκοον γενέσθαι τοῖς ῥήμασι θεοῦ* (James 2: 23). Shortly after he says: *ἐπίστευσε Ἀβραάμ τῷ θεῷ, καὶ ἐλογίσθη αὐτῷ εἰς δικαιοσύνην.*—He, moreover, like James (2: 21), argues from the sacrifice made by Abraham, that he united works with

faith: *διὰ πίστιν—καὶ δι' ὑπακοῆς προσήνεγκεν αὐτοῦ (τὸν υἱὸν) θυσίαν τῷ θεῷ.*

In like manner, he says in regard to Rahab, that she was saved because she conjoined works with faith, because she harbored and preserved the spies of Joshua: *διὰ πίστιν καὶ φιλοξενίαν ἐσώθη Ραάβ ἡ πόρνη . . . εἰσδεδεξαμένη αὐτοὺς ἔκρυπεν, εἰς τὸ ὑπερῶν . . . καὶ ἐξηγάγε αὐτούς.*

Among the passages which Lardner has selected from the writings of Hermas as coincident with James, there are three of which we can recognize the local source. Were there but one, the coincidence might more easily be ascribed to accident; but chance is out of the question in a case of repeated agreement in thought and language. “*Nefandis verbis Dominum insectati, nomen ejus negaverunt, quod super nos erat invocatum*” (*Similit. VIII. 6*). *Βλασφημοῦσι τὸ καλὸν ὄνομα τὸ ἐπικληθὲν ἐφ’ ὑμᾶς* (James 2: 7). “*Si enim resistitis illi (diabolo) fugiet a vobis confusus*” (*Mandat. XII. 5*). *Ἀνίστιντε τῷ διαβόλῳ, καὶ φεύξεται ἀφ’ ὑμῶν* (James 4: 7). “*Qui potest vos salvos facere et perdere*” (*Mand. XII. 6*). *Ὁ δυναμενος σωσαι καὶ ἀπολέσαι* (James 4: 12).

In a work of Irenæus, too, a passage is quoted concerning Abraham’s justification, which is found, word for word as it there stands, in James, and nowhere else: “*Quod Abraham sine circumcisione et sine observantiâ sabbatorum credidit Deo et reputatum est illi ad justitiam, et amicus Dei vocatus est*” (L. Adv. Hær. IV. c. 16. James 2: 23). As this father had not long before (L. IV. c. 8) quoted with perfect accuracy the parallel passage from Paul (Rom. 4: 3), it cannot be regarded as a peculiar reading in his Ms. of the Epistle to the Romans; and as, moreover, it does not appear thus anywhere in the Old Testament, we cannot but consider it as a quotation from the Epistle of James, although the name of the author is not mentioned.

Early, however, as this Epistle was probably known to the Latins, it is not quoted expressly before the fourth century in any of the works of Latin fathers which are still extant. Jerome even tells us that it was regarded as the work of another author, and that it was only in process of time, “*paullatim tempore procedente,*” that it acquired estimation and credit.<sup>1</sup> It is probable that the council of Carthage had some share in the more favorable reception which this Epistle henceforth met with among the Latins.

It is worthy of notice, however, that in the east, where from circumstances this composition must have been best known, it was also highly appreciated. Syria, where better information than elsewhere must have existed in regard to a writing originating in Palestine, included this Epistle in its earliest church-version, and persisted in retaining it after the subsequent rejection of all the other disputed Catholic Epistles.

Ephraem made use of it in many places, most evidently in his Greek works, and attributed it to James, the brother of our Lord. Other Syriac writers after him have used it like other sacred books, sometimes even naming the author. Their testimonies have been collected and arranged with industry and judgment by a deceased scholar.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Hieronym. Catal. v. Jacobus.

<sup>2</sup> Ephraem, Opp. Græc. T. III. p. 51. Ἰάκωβος δὲ ὁ τοῦ κυρίου ἀδελ-



Some countries of Asia Minor, like the Syriac church, acknowledged but three Catholic Epistles, that of James, and the 1st of Peter and John. Whether the well-known Iambics, which attest this, were written by Gregory Nazianzen or Amphilocheus of Iconium, the value of their testimony is the same.<sup>1</sup>

The African church affords us no such favorable evidence respecting this Epistle as is furnished by the eastern and western. Before the 3d century we find only very probable references to this writing by the Greek fathers, references not by any means sufficiently exact to be regarded as identical passages. The most prominent of these is a passage in Clement of Alexandria: *Ἐὰν μὴ—σὺν τῷ μετὰ τῆς ἐν τούτοις τελειώσεως καὶ τῷ τὸν πλησίον ἀγαπᾶν, καὶ ἐνέργειᾳ δύνασθαι οὐκ ἔσσεσθε βασιλικοί.*<sup>2</sup> Comp. James 2: 8. Origen is the first who mentions this Epistle clearly and expressly, and from him we learn, indeed, that it was extensively known in the third century and long before, under the name of James; but that opinions were various in regard to its authority.<sup>3</sup> After him Dionysius of Alexandria mentions the Epistle and refers to James 1: 13, and 4: 1.<sup>4</sup>

Eusebius represents the opinions of his predecessors in much the same manner as Origen. He says that the Epistle is a disputed book, because the ancients have rarely referred to it. He however adds that many esteem it genuine.<sup>5</sup>

This latter opinion finally preponderated, and after the fourth century it was used by most of the Greek fathers like the other biblical books, out of regard to the established usage of the church.

## § 162.

We may easily conceive that the striking contrast between the doctrines of this Epistle and the doctrines of Paul must have hindered the favorable reception of the former. A writer who thus disputed what was taught by an acknowledged apostle, an apostle whose disciples and admirers were scattered in great numbers throughout many countries, the apostle, too, of the Gentiles, could not but meet with oppo-

φὸς λέγει· Πενθήσατε καὶ κλαύσατε κ. τ. λ. Comp. L. I. p. 18. Hassencamp's Observations on the last §§ of Michaelis' Introd. p. 27—31.

<sup>1</sup> Καθολικῶν ἐπιστολῶν τινες μὲν ἐπὶ φασιν, οἱ δὲ τρεῖς μόνας χρῆναι δέχεσθαι, τὴν Ἰακώβου μίαν, μίαν δὲ Πέτρον, τὴν τ' Ἰωάννου μίαν. Opp. Greg. Naz. T. II. p. 195.

<sup>2</sup> Strom. L. VI. p. 825. Ed. Venet.

<sup>3</sup> Comm. in Jo. Tom. 19. Ἐὰν δὲ λέγεται μὲν πίστις, χωρὶς δὲ ἔργων τυγχάνη, νεκρά ἐστίν ἡ τοιαύτη, ὡς ἐν τῇ φερομένῃ Ἰακώβου ἀνεγγωνεν. Tom. 21. Οὐ συγχωρηθὲν ἂν ὑπὸ τῶν παραδεχομένων τὸ, ἡπίστις χωρὶς ἔργων νεκρά ἐστίν.

<sup>4</sup> Dionysii Alexand., cognomento Magni, quæ supersunt. Romæ MDCCXCVII. Typ. Congr. de prop. Ed. Simon de Magistris, Episc. Cyrenens. In his "Libell. de Martyrio," c. 6. p. 32. c. 7. p. 33, and "Fragm. ex Schol. Græc. in Epist. Jacobi," p. 200.

<sup>5</sup> Hist. Eccles. L. II. c. 23. L. III c. 25.

nents, even though he himself, likewise, were an apostle. That he actually met with them, is not surprising. But it would be very strange that any one should have invented this Epistle and then, to procure it authority, ascribed it to James, without taking the essential precaution of at least giving it such a tenor as would not render its success difficult, at any rate not excite distrust and opposition at the outset.

When a writing seemed in its entire purport to clash with previous apostolic doctrines, how many arguments must it have had in its favor, how many proofs of its genuineness, in order to acquire so much consideration in a great many churches, as to rank with the sacred books in the Apostolic Codex. If the contrariety to Paul was, with many churches, no hindrance to such a disposal of it, the conviction must certainly have become strong that it was the production of a sacred writer, whom no one might presume to gainsay.

### § 163.

With what views did the apostle compose this Epistle? There is no doubt that it was his chief object to enforce the observance of the moral law, as the principal purpose of religion, with special reference to his own times and the wants and condition of those who were immediately about him and committed to his guidance, and next, to his other contemporaries and their circumstances.

If we were acquainted with the local and other circumstances of the time, much light would be thrown upon a great part of this Epistle, and, though it is usually regarded as a collection of individual sentences, and detached passages without continuous connexion, its different parts would acquire a real mutual dependence, which is now imperceptible in the rapid transitions of the author, and which cannot be discerned until the intermediate ideas are supplied from the circumstances of the time and the chasms in the connexion are thus filled up. With our present means this is not completely feasible; but an imperfect picture of the author's time and situation, may serve as an incitement to the production of a better.

We see from the Epistle, that one of the principal troubles of the author was the πολλοὶ διδάσκαλοι, the many arrogant persons, who knew every thing in respect to religious matters and determined them at once with the utmost confidence. It is on this account that he complains most earnestly of a small member, the tongue, upon which he charges great injury to the doctrines of Christ (3: 1—10. 1: 19, 20).

There had become prevalent, particularly among the Jewish Christians, an opinion respecting the exceeding efficacy of faith, according to which man could by it become acceptable to God, without the difficult observance of the moral law and without virtue.

From what source this opinion arose, it is not difficult to divine, since its advocates availed themselves of the arguments which Paul had used, in the Epistle to the Romans, to show the superfluous nature of works and the power of faith. They did not however intend in their tenet the works of Judaism, but considered the Mosaic law as still the rule of life and conduct, the Messiah and his doctrines as necessary subjects of belief. Thus Christianity was made to take a subordinate rank; it could indeed claim assent, but obedience was due to the law.

These and similar points respecting the law and Christianity, about which there was little unanimity for a long time, were never contested without exciting the bitterest feelings of party animosity. At Corinth and in the churches of Galatia this controversy was prosecuted with zeal and asperity; and James saw and dreaded it within his own charge.

As to the external circumstances and civil condition of the Jews and Jewish Christians, they were very far from being desirable. The prætors practised extortion under every pretext, and abused their judicial authority for their own emolument. Liberation from prison, security, and justice were to be obtained only by money, and one might even purchase a license to commit crime.<sup>1</sup>

Hence, many in an abject manner courted the favor of the rich, ἀνὴρ χρυσοδακτύλιος,<sup>2</sup> and the poor were obliged to endure all kinds of ignominy, even in the Christian congregations, where it was least to be tolerated (2: 2—10).

The public oppressions were grievous, but the evils which the author foresaw were yet greater (1: 3, 4, 12, 13, 14). The crying injustice practised on all sides evidently called for retributive chastisement on the part of God (V. 1—7).

It does not appear from any of his expressions that the Romans were at hand; but the popular ferment and the inefficacy of the laws had already reached so high a pitch as to occasion scenes of violence and blood: μάχεσθε καὶ πολεμεῖτε—γονεύετε καὶ ζηλοῦτε (4: 1, 2, 3, 5: 6).

Under Felix, and again under Porcius Festus, vast bands of exasperated patriots marched through the country, violently forcing the inhabitants of unfortified places to accompany them, or, if they refused, setting their villages on fire and perpetrating the bloodiest deeds. They even appeared in the capital and at the feasts, where they mixed with the crowd of people, and effected many secret assassinations with concealed weapons.<sup>3</sup>

The public disorder and lawlessness had already become so great, that the writer believed the moment of retribution not far remote: κριτῆς πρὸ τῶν θυρῶν ἐστικώς (V. 9).

To escape the threatened danger many meditated seeking a residence in other countries.<sup>4</sup> They relied upon their commercial capaci-

<sup>1</sup> Acts 24: 26. Tacit. Hist. L. V. c. 10. The following passage, it is true, relates to the times immediately subsequent to the death of James; it is however true in part of the administration of Felix: Καὶ χρόμασι μὲν οἱ δυνατοὶ τὸν Ἀλβινὸν προσελάμβανον, ὥστε τοῦ στασιάζειν αὐτοῖς παρῆγεν ἄδειαν. Jos. B. J. L. II. c. 24. p. 738. Basil. c. 14. Ed. Haverc.

<sup>2</sup> Some of the Jews were raised to the rank of Roman knights, ἄνδρες ἱππικοῦ τάγματος, Jos. B. J. L. II. c. 25. p. 740. Basil. ed. c. 14. n. 9. Haverc. whence they are called χρυσοδακτύλιοι.

<sup>3</sup> Jos. Ant. Jud. L. XX. c. 6. 7. p. 617—620. Basil. c. 8. n. 5 seq. Haverc. Comp. Bell. Jud. L. II. c. 13. n. 3, 5, 6.

<sup>4</sup> This emigration really took place soon after under Albinus, and to a still greater degree under Florus. Ant. Jud. L. XX. c. ult. p. 624. and De Bell. Jud. L. II. c. 24. p. 738. c. 14. n. 2. Haverc.

ty for subsistence, and hoped by removing to avoid participation in the national misery, without considering that their fate (ἐὰν ὁ κύριος θελήσῃ), and even their lives, which they wished to save, were in the hand of God, and that, if a higher power had so ordered, they must suffer punishment in their own country, which they had harassed and ill-treated (4: 13—17. 5: 1—6).

Such, nearly, was the condition, such the circumstances, and the degree of civil disorder, in which the writer saw his countrymen; for, although he wrote to the whole world, his native land was immediately before his eyes.

### § 164.

When was this Epistle written? It was composed after the Epistle to the Hebrews; but it cannot have been written long after that Epistle reached Palestine, i. e. the beginning of the 10th year of Nero. For, even if the narrative concerning the death of James, the brother of our Lord, which we find in the 20th book of Josephus' Antiquities, be not from Josephus himself, it is certainly one of very great antiquity, inasmuch as Origen in his Commentaries on Matthew and his work against Celsus, and Eusebius likewise, ascribe it to the Jewish writer.

According to this account, James was murdered, through the violence of the high priest, in the interval between the death of Porcius Festus and the accession of Albinus.

We have no direct authentic information as to the time when Albinus took his station, or how long he held it in the rapid mutation of affairs; but it is clear, if we compare the statements of Josephus in regard to Gessius Florus, that this Albinus commenced his administration in the tenth year of Nero, and did not hold it long. Florus succeeded Albinus. Under him the Jewish war broke out, about the close of the twelfth year of Nero, and then Florus had at least commenced the second year of his government.

The Epistle of James, therefore, cannot have been written before that to the Hebrews, i. e. the beginning of the 10th year of Nero, nor after the accession of Albinus, i. e. the close of the same year. It was written some time in this year, the year of his death.

### § 165.

We must now state the contents of this Epistle. At the commencement, he exhorts them to steadfastness under the trying circumstances of the time. We obtain wisdom, he says, from God, and we must therefore pray for it (1: 1—9). Let no one think too highly of himself; we are all frail creatures; blessed is he that endureth temptation. Let no man charge our temptations to evil upon God: the reason of them lies in ourselves. From God proceeds rather all good; as, for instance, the precious gift of Christianity, the principles of which we should not only be acquainted with, but practise in our lives (—27).

Christianity recognizes no distinction between the rich and the poor. This fact demands the more attention, because religion requires the fulfilment of every precept in its full extent (2: 18). It is no mere faith or speculative belief, but a law of virtue to be obeyed in practice (—3:).

Those who set themselves up as teachers incur much responsibility;



we err in no way more easily than with the tongue. Let him who is conscious of peculiar religious attainments, evince them in his life. Wisdom is a child of heaven, modest, peaceable, without malevolence (—4:). Your evil and turbulent conduct shows that you do not yet possess it; pray for it, therefore, and approach God with humility. Judge not others; there is one judge for all (—13).

Let no one imagine that it rests with him to escape the retribution which awaits the country. Ye rich men, ye must here receive the reward of your arrogance (—5: 7).

Let all persevere with patience; keep the ancient examples of suffering before your eyes—the final day, the Judge, are at hand. Swear not; a promise is of itself sacred. Is any sick? let him call the elders of the church to anoint him and pray over him. The prayer of a righteous man is effectual. Finally, let every one endeavor to restore an erring companion to the right way.

### § 166.

And now, in conclusion, how can the discrepancy between Paul and James be reconciled? The former maintains the saving efficacy of faith without works, and the latter the inutility of faith without them. What did each understand by works and faith?

Both the writings in which Paul exhibits his position were directed against Judaism, against the obligation of its precepts upon Christians. Faith, therefore, in accordance with his object, is contrasted with Judaism and the works of the law.

This contrast is expressed very distinctly in Rom. 3: 21—4:, where the favor and mercy of God are ascribed to faith alone *χωρὶς νόμου* and *χωρὶς ἔργων νόμου*. From the example of Abraham, which is then adduced in support of this doctrine, the author deduces the conclusion, that the favor of God was bestowed upon the father of his nation, *διὰ τῆς πίστεως*, aside from the Jewish constitution and the observance of its precepts, which as yet had no existence (4:—5: &c.).

This *πίστις*, however, is with him a confident reliance on God's assurances, *ἐλπίς* in reference to the *ἐπαγγελία* which he had long ago given, that he would bless the world, as we have observed in treating of the Epistle to the Hebrews (§ 145).

With James, *πίστις* is the acknowledgment of the doctrines of Christianity, assent to the Christian theory (2: 19, 14, 15), and *ἔργα* are the actual fulfilment of its precepts. The former, the bare speculative acknowledgment of the truths of religion, without any application to human conduct, is useless and dead (1: 23).

Thus each has seen and judged correctly from his own point of view, and neither contravenes the ideas or disparages the doctrine of the other.

But James openly combats the particular arguments with which Paul supports his doctrine, and evinces so special a reference to the writings of Paul in the treatment of his subject, that we can hardly explain everything, without supposing that he had them in his mind. Thus, it will be said, not only is there contradiction, but, what is still worse, it sprang from a misapprehension.

We must consider, however, that James wrote to the dispersed Jews, and controverted Paul as they understood him. If they did not comprehend him, if they substituted for his representations their own notions, and would not understand that Moses and the ceremonial law were no longer the rule of religious action; if they made use of his arguments in support of their opinion, and justified with them the notions they had substituted for his, can James be charged with not understanding Paul, because he attacked the erroneous interpretations which they made of Paul's meaning and arguments?

No: James did not write against Paul, but only against an error of the time, which the Jewish converts, in order to sustain their prejudices, had deduced from his writings, and the consequences of which were very evident immediately around him. It was to be feared that it might be communicated thence to all the Jewish Christians elsewhere, and frustrate far and wide every purpose and hope of Christianity. As head of the church at Jerusalem, he interposed his authority to prevent this threatened result, addressing himself to all the believing Jews in the world, for the purpose of sustaining the cause of virtue and practical religion.

### § 167.

#### THE FIRST EPISTLE OF THE APOSTLE PETER.

This Epistle was, according to the address at the commencement, directed to the Jewish Christians in Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Bithynia, and Asia (1: 1).

There is one thing which strikes us at the outset of an attentive examination of it, viz. that between it and some of the Epistles of Paul which were directed to these provinces there is a great similarity, as respects the thought and expression and even their very plan. The fact is certain, the proofs of it are evident, nor is its explanation difficult.

Peter had not seen the Asiatic provinces. They lay within the sphere of Paul's duties, and he had travelled through them, dispensing instruction to the inhabitants, and even while imprisoned at a distance had not lost sight of them. He was acquainted with their manner of life, failings, virtues, and vices, their general condition, and the proper mode of dealing with them.

Now when an urgent occasion required the intervention of Peter, his consolation, or instruction, the Epistles of his esteemed colleague might well in such a case furnish him with directions for his procedure. We find that the Epistles to the Ephesians and the Colossians and the first to Timothy were especially made use of by the apostle, and frequently guided him in the matter and manner of his Epistle.

After a form of salutation, Peter commences thus (1: 3): *Εὐλογητὸς ὁ θεὸς καὶ πατὴρ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, ὁ . . . ἀναγεννήσας κ. τ. λ.* Just so Paul to the Ephesians (1: 3): *Εὐλογητὸς ὁ θεὸς καὶ πατὴρ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, ὁ εὐλόγησας κ. τ. λ.*

Peter then extols Christianity, its saving efficacy, its exalted founder, his dignity and benevolent commiseration, which merit the adoration

of men and angels. All this part of the Epistle very much resembles in thought and language, Paul's introduction to his Epistle to the Ephesians and Colossians.

When this preparatory matter is concluded, he makes the following transition (2: 1): *Αποθέμενοι οὖν πᾶσαν κακίαν, καὶ πάντα δόλον, καὶ ὑποκρίσεις, καὶ φθόνους, καὶ πάσας καταλαλίας.* This transition occurs likewise in the Epistle to the Colossians (3: 8): *Λυτὶ δὲ ἀποθεσθε καὶ ὑμεῖς τὰ πάντα, ὀργήν, θυμὸν, κακίαν, βλασφημίαν, αἰσχρολογίαν*; a substitution of synonymes constituting their whole difference.

In speaking, as the case required, of their civil and domestic relations, he again consults Paul as to what it would be most pertinent to suggest.

## 1 Pet. 2: 13 seq.

*ῥποτάγητε οὖν*

*πάσῃ ἀνθρωπίνῃ κτίσει . . . .*

*εἴτε βασιλεῖ,  
ὡς ὑπερέχοντι . . . .*

*Ὅτι οὕτως ἐστὶ  
τὸ θελημα τοῦ Θεοῦ.*

## 1 Pet. 2: 18.

*Οἱ οἰκέται,  
ὑποτασσόμενοι  
ἐν παντὶ φόβῳ  
τοῖς δεσπόταις·*

## 1 Pet. 3: 1.

*Ὅμοιως αἱ γυναῖκες  
ὑποτασσόμεναι  
τοῖς ἰδίοις ἀνδράσιν*

.....

*Ἐποπτεύσαντες τὴν ἐν φόβῳ  
ἀγνὴν ἀναστροφὴν ὑμῶν.*

*Ὡν ἔστω οὗχ ὁ ἑξωθεν  
ἐμπλοκῆς τριχῶν  
καὶ περιθέσεως χρυσίων,  
ἢ ἐνδύσεως ἱματίων  
κόσμος.*

## 1 Tim. 2 seq.

*Παρακαλῶ οὖν πρῶτον πάντων  
ποιεῖσθαι δεήσεις, προσευχάς, ἐν-  
τεύξεις, εὐχαριστίας,  
ὑπὲρ πάντων ἀνθρώπων.  
ὑπὲρ βασιλέων,  
καὶ πάντων τῶν ἐν ἐπεροχῇ ὄντων*

*Τοῦτο γὰρ καλὸν καὶ ἀπόδεκτον  
ἐνώπιον . . . τοῦ Θεοῦ.*

## Ephes. 6: 5.

*Οἱ δοῦλοι  
ὑπακούετε  
τοῖς κυρίοις κατὰ σάρκα  
μετὰ φόβου καὶ τρόμου.*

## Col. 3: 18.

*Αἱ γυναῖκες  
ὑποτάσσεσθε  
τοῖς ἰδίοις ἀνδράσιν*

## 1 Tim. 2: 9.

*Ἐν καταστολῇ κοσμίῳ μετὰ αἰδοῦς  
καὶ σωφροσύνης κοσμεῖν ἑαυτάς,*

*μή  
ἐν πλέγμασιν,  
ἢ χρυσῷ,  
ἢ μαργαρίταις, ἢ ἱματισμῷ  
πολυτελεῖ.*

The thoughts, as likewise the purport and number of the clauses, are nearly the same, and even the deviations in expression evince a more than accidental relationship. Though *ὑπερέχων* is used for *ἐν ὑπεροχῇ ὄν*, for *πλέγμασιν* the words *ἐμπλοκῇ τριχῶν*, and *περίθεσις χρυ-*

σίῳν for χοῦσός, the fact manifests rather a design of avoiding identity in expression than any essential difference. Peter himself, too, is so far from denying his acquaintance with Paul's Epistles, that he even refers his readers expressly to these writings of his beloved brother (2 Pet. 3: 15), and recommends their perusal.

## § 168.

Moreover, we find some passages which coincide entirely with passages in James; e. g.

## 1 Pet. 1: 6, 7.

Ἐν ᾧ ἀγαλλιᾶσθε  
ὀλίγον ἄρτι . . . .  
λυπηθέντες  
ἐν ποικίλοις πειρασμοῖς·  
ἵνα τὸ δοκίμιον ὑμῶν  
τῆς πίστεως  
εὐξηθῇ εἰς ἔπαινον κ. τ. λ.

## 1 Pet. 1: 24.

Διότι πᾶσα σὰρξ  
ὥς χόρτος  
καὶ πᾶσα δόξα αὐτῆς  
ὥς ἄνθος χόρτου.

Ἐξηράνθη ὁ χόρτος  
καὶ τὸ ἄνθος αὐτοῦ  
ἐξέπεσε.

## 1 Pet. 5: 5, 6.

Ὅτι ὁ θεὸς ὑπερφεράνοις ἀντιτάσσεται,  
ταπεινοῖς δὲ  
δίδωσι χάριν.  
Ταπεινώθητε οὖν  
ὑπὸ τὴν κραταιὰν χεῖρα  
τοῦ θεοῦ,  
ἵνα ὑμᾶς ὑψώσῃ.

## James 1: 2 seq.

Πᾶσαν χαρὰν ἡγήσασθε . . . .  
ὅταν  
περιπέσῃτε  
πειρασμοῖς ποικίλοις·  
γινώσκοντες  
ὅτι τὸ δοκίμιον ὑμῶν  
τῆς πίστεως  
κατεργάζεται ὑπομονήν· κ. τ. λ.

## James 1: 10 seq.

Ὅτι

ὥς ἄνθος χόρτου παρελεύσεται·  
ἀνέτειλε ὁ ἥλιος σὺν τῷ καύσωνι,  
καὶ ἐξήρανε τὸν χόρτον,  
καὶ τὸ ἄνθος αὐτοῦ  
ἐξέπεσε.

## James 4: 6, 10.

Ὁ θεὸς ὑπερφεράνοις ἀντιτάσσεται,  
ταπεινοῖς δὲ  
δίδωσι χάριν . . . .  
Ταπεινώθητε  
ἐνώπιον  
τοῦ κυρίου  
καὶ ὑψώσει ὑμᾶς.

The passage in 1 Pet. 5: 5, and James 4: 6, is taken, it is true, from Proverbs 3: 34, and the coincidence in regard to it may have been accidental; but the precisely similar conclusions drawn from it by both (similar in language as well as substance) makes accident wholly improbable. There is, moreover, another instance, 1 Peter 4: 8 and James 5: 20, in which accident must be supposed to have led them for



the second time to the same passage in the same book : "*Οτι ἡ ἀγάπη καλύψει πλῆθος ἁμαρτιῶν*—and *ἐπιστρέψας ἁμαρτωλὸν . . . καὶ καλύψει πλῆθος ἁμαρτιῶν* (See Prov. 10: 12).

The question, which of them transferred these parts from the composition of the other into his own, depends, no doubt, upon the question, which first published his Epistle? This is not, however, a mere matter of curiosity, but involves important consequences, one of which we will here mention. If, as was really the case, James composed his Epistle first, the parts alluded to must certainly have been drawn from James, and then can any higher proof be required that the Epistle of James is a genuine monument of the apostolic age? Could the testimony of other witnesses be of so much effect in satisfying us of this, as a proof resting on so high, so unexceptionable authority?

### § 169.

The main object of the Epistle is to inspire and console persons in distress; and its contents are as follows:

I salute you through Jesus Christ, through whom God will conduct us to glory, if we endure with constancy our present trials, which are for our benefit. For the end of them is a state of blessedness which even he who purchased it, though so exalted, attained only by his sufferings (—1: 13).

Therefore, prepare yourselves for the moment when this reward shall be bestowed. Be worthy of the Lord, ye who are purchased by his sufferings, and worthy of the hopes which we have through him. We are destined for something higher than the enjoyment of this fleeting life (—2: 1).

Lay aside every thing which defiles you and renders you unworthy of him. He is the centre of all our hopes, our pattern, and Saviour (—2: 11). So regulate your conduct, that no one can reproach you as evil-doers; render honest obedience to the powers that be (—2: 18).

This precept extends also to servants and slaves in relation to their masters; for even to them the meek and suffering Jesus should be an example (—3:). Women, too, should be submissive, modest, considering noiseless virtue as their greatest ornament; men should cherish and honor them (—3: 8).

All should be full of sympathy, love, and indulgence towards each other, and be guiltless, every moment able to answer for themselves, that their adversaries and calumniators may be ashamed; for Christ hath suffered once for all that he might procure us a good conscience and make us acceptable to God (—4:).

Our past transgressions, for which Jesus suffered, should no longer be discoverable in us; we should rather make preparation by our lives for a great catastrophe, which is not far distant (—4: 12). When this takes place, we shall have opportunity to suffer with joyful endurance, as Jesus did. It will be happy for us if we are reproached as his disciples, and not as criminals (—5:).

Therefore, ye elders, watch over your flocks; ye that are subordinate, demean yourselves as such! Let every one lay aside worldly

cares; be on the watch; our trial is great. God give you strength! I have already written once to you by Sylvanus, and now salute you again.

### § 170.

We must close our eyes, not to perceive that the whole of this Epistle is directed to one end, the preparation of the churches of Asia Minor for severe suffering. Its moral instructions are only subsidiary. The exhortations to renounce evil, to acquire a pure conscience, to refute the calumnies of the time by their innocence, to abstain from violent disputes, to pay respect to the powers that were, to exercise increased love and fidelity towards each other, etc. are merely directions how to alleviate their fearful fate or bear it better. In like manner, the repeated references to the example of Jesus in his sufferings and death are designed to strengthen them for the endurance of calamitous occurrences. The exhortation to the slaves, too, has reference to the unhappy days in which, for real or imaginary wrongs and hardships, they frequently became the accusers and betrayers of their masters. We therefore with propriety inquire, what were the events in history for which the author of this Epistle wished to prepare the churches of the five provinces.

1. He describes them in the following manner. It is not to be thought strange that a fiery trial awaits believers, to try their character; for in this respect they only have a common lot with the founder of their religion (4: 12, 13). He declares the dreaded trial to be a judgment from God, which would be begun by him in his own household, and on that account would only be the more terrible in its final operation upon those who were not his followers (4: 17); or a day of visitation, such as God has appointed to decide the fate of whole nations, יום בִּקְרָה, Isaiah 10: 3, יְהִי יוֹם, Jer. 10: 15, καιρός ἐπισκοπῆς, Luke 19: 44. Such a day, ἡμερὰ ἐπισκοπῆς (2: 12) awaits them; and they should endure it to the glory of God. A comparison of the passages referred to may put the force of the figure in its full light. He further declares that the enemy of Christ and adversary of all good is now going about like a ravenous lion seeking his prey, and that the sufferings which threatened them were to be experienced, not within a limited sphere, but among all their brethren in the faith, ἀδελφοί; not in the Roman empire alone, but in the whole world, ἐν κόσμῳ, among the *socii* and *federati*, all who were desirous of being on good terms with the Romans (5: 8, 9).

These traits, which go to make up the picture of the condition of Christians in the five provinces, denote no particular local disturbances on the part of the Jews, nor brief outrages here and there on the part of the populace; but they refer to a time of terror and calamity to the Christians generally, not only in all Asia Minor, but in the whole world. The magnitude and universality of the evil evince that it must have proceeded from the highest civil authority, which alone could occasion so wide spread and simultaneous a result. Now there is no event which can have had such important and general effects, but the

first persecution of the Christians, in which Nero, with ingenious wantonness, set an example for others.

2. A second criterion is contained in the passages 2: 12. 3: 16. 4: 16. The accusation had gone abroad against the adherents to the new religion, that they were evil doers, *κακοποιοί*; so that indeed the name *Χριστιανός* denoted a person deserving of punishment. Heretofore, all complaints had related to a difference in religious views, in reference to which the Jews were always accusers, except in the case of the complaint made by the silver-smiths of Ephesus. At Corinth Gallio drove them from his judgment-seat, and justly acknowledged that no crime or misdemeanor was apparent (Acts 18: 14—16). Felix and Festus, together with king Agrippa, regarded the accusation made before them, although the high-priests were the complainants, as a dispute about doctrines, and could perceive no criminality (Acts 24:—27:). At Ephesus it was even the case that one of the officers of the city defended the Christians, and declared them guiltless of any crime against the goddess or the holy image (Acts 19: 37). The name *Χριστιανός*, so late as towards the end of the 7th year of Nero's reign, was so far from being an odious one, that Agrippa did not consider the adoption of it as degrading, or prejudicial to his royal dignity: *ἐν ὀλίγῳ με πέθεις Χριστιανὸν γενέσθαι* (Acts 26: 28).

It was far from being thought of, even at this time, to charge the whole body of Christians with criminal conduct; and no trace of such an accusation appears till three years later, when Nero charged upon the Christians his own crime, the monstrous conflagration in the capital, and punished them as the authors of the abominable deed. It is on this occasion that they first occur in Roman history as a new, peculiar sect, termed *Christiani* from their founder *Christus*; and many severe accusations are heaped upon them.<sup>1</sup>

3. It was necessary that they should be always ready to exculpate themselves (3: 15) and to be led away to punishment, not merely exposed to revilings, but (as appears from the *tertium comparationis* which the apostle uses) to suffer as thieves, murderers, and seditious persons (though far from being such), i. e. to meet death or such punishments as were awarded to grievous crimes—and this because they were *Χριστιανοί* (4: 15, 16). Accordingly, he says that he who is appointed to suffer by the will of God should commend his soul to his Creator (4: 19), or, in other words, die a pious death (Luke 23: 46. Acts 7: 59).<sup>2</sup> There is no ground of probability, much less any historical evidence, that Christians in the Roman empire out of Palestine were punished with death for their religion before the time we have mentioned.

According to the Annals of Tacitus, the first examples of such cruelty were presented at Rome under the Consuls Lecanius and M. Licinius Crassus, in the tenth consulate of Nero's reign.

The conflagration, which was the cause or occasion of the persecution, began on the *XIII. Kal. Scitiles*,<sup>3</sup> in the latter part of July; but the persecution did not commence immediately. Devices of every kind

<sup>1</sup> Tacit. Annal. XV. 44.

<sup>2</sup> Pott, Ep. Cath. Vol. II. Ed. secunda ad 1 Peter 4: 19.

<sup>3</sup> Lipsius, in Excurs. A. ad Tacit. Ann. L. XV.

were employed, to quiet the indignation of those who had suffered by the conflagration; days of expiation appointed to conciliate the gods; and every method used to do away the odium excited against Nero. Finally, when all was in vain, persons were sought for who could be held up as the criminals, and the Christians were selected.

The Epistle cannot have been written before these terrible events, which must have occurred late in this year, and have filled all who bore the name of Christian with consternation.

Nor can it have been written till a considerable later period. For we must suppose the lapse of several months before the news could reach the oriental provinces of the empire. An additional interval must also have elapsed before the apostle could gain information respecting the condition and fearful apprehensions of the churches.

Thus the Epistle was certainly not written in this year, but in the following consulate, or the eleventh year of Nero's reign.

Whether the persecution extended beyond the walls of the city to the remote provinces of the empire, or whether, on this occasion, they were only distressed with apprehensions, history does not inform us. Peter rather represents the misfortune as to be apprehended than already in existence (1: 6), *εἰ δέον ἐστὶ* (3: 17) *εἰ θελεῖ τὸ θελημα τοῦ θεοῦ*, *if need be, if the will of God be so*. The fear, however, was well-grounded; for what might not be apprehended, when in the centre of the empire, the source of all civil authority, such accusations had been made against the fraternity of Christians, and every former invention of cruelty had been exceeded in their punishment?

The prospect was terrible, even if it never was realized; a mortal agony must have been upon them, even though the stroke was averted by a higher power. The dreadful event at Rome must have spread terror among all Christians. It was certainly the most momentous occurrence in regard to Christianity which had taken place since its rise, and we should have had good reason for wonder, had it occasioned no letter of consolation, had it left no trace of itself in the apostolic writings.

### § 171.

We wish here to recal to mind what we have before shown respecting the Epistle of James from internal marks and by analysis, or, as in another case we should rather say, from reasons of higher criticism; viz. that the Epistle was written in Palestine, by an inhabitant of Palestine, and by that James, among several of the name, who was the brother of our Lord. Now (as appears from § 168) either Peter has appropriated to himself figures and clauses from the Epistle of James, or, *vice versâ*, James borrowed them from the Epistle of Peter; and the decision of the alternative depends solely on the chronological relation which the Epistles bear to each other. The date of the Epistle of Peter is definitely ascertained. It was written in the eleventh year of Nero; while, on the other hand, the brother of our Lord, to whom, not arbitrarily but with good reason, we attribute the Epistle which bears the name of James, died as early as the tenth year of Nero (§ 164). Thus Peter, who wrote latest, bears witness to the previous existence



of the Epistle of James, and, not only so, but his testimony assures us, moreover, that it came from some James, the appropriation of whose language Peter did not consider to be beneath his dignity as an apostle. While, then, the Epistle of James is not deficient in internal verification, and only wants external evidence, particularly among the Greek fathers, Peter's recognition of it is ample indemnification for the deficiency.

### § 172.

The first Epistle of Peter was written from Babylon (5: 13). *Ἡ ἐν Βαβυλῶνι συνεκλεκτή* i. e. *ἐκκλησία*, is termed *συνεκλεκτή* in reference to the *ἐκλεκτοῖς παρεπιδήμοις* in 1: 1. The most recent expositor of the Epistle is inclined to understand by *ἡ ἐν Βαβυλῶνι συνεκλεκτή*, the wife of Peter, as if the apostle intended to say, *my wife, whom I have left behind at Babylon, saluteth you*; and from this interpretation draws the inference, that Peter must have written the Epistle at some other place than Babylon.<sup>1</sup> How did she know, then, that her husband was writing to Asia Minor? or how did he receive commission from his wife to salute the churches of the five provinces? By letter or message, it may be said. But any thing of this nature must have been attended with much delay and uncertainty. Suppose, then, that Peter commenced his Epistle at Babylon, and finished it while on a journey. At all events, Peter, according to this opinion, had but a short time before been at Babylon, where he left his wife, and where he had received information respecting the condition of the provinces of Asia Minor, and had determined to write to them soon. At all events, moreover, the Epistle was written at no great distance from Babylon.

This name brings first to every one's mind the celebrated Babylon upon the Euphrates. There was another, however, in Egypt, not far from Memphis;<sup>2</sup> and some will have it that by Babylon is meant Rome, because the Apocalypse makes use of this metonymy in regard to Rome; not considering that, though it may be very proper in a work wholly of a symbolical character, it would not be expected in the subscription to an Epistle, even though *arcana nomina ecclesiarum* existed among Christians.

When the name Babylon is used alone, one would think it must denote the ancient renowned city, which is first suggested to every one's mind, *Babylon per eminentiam*; one less celebrated would have been mentioned with some mark of distinction, as, e. g., Babylon in Egypt.

But, it is objected, were there any Jews at that time in ancient Babylon? At first the question may appear ridiculous. How often does Josephus speak of Jews in Babylon, as does also, at a later period, the Talmud of them and their celebrated school in that city. But the passages in Josephus refer to an earlier period, and those in the Talmud to one considerably later than the date of this Epistle. In the latter part of the reign of Caius Caligula a great change took place in the condi-

<sup>1</sup> Pott, Ep. Cath. Vol. II. Ed. altera ad 1 Pet. 5: 13.

<sup>2</sup> Diod. L. I. c. 56. Jos. Ant. L. II. c. 15. Antonini Itin. p. 169. Ed. Wesseling.

tion of the Jews of Babylon. The Babylonians, highly exasperated at the insolence of a powerful Jew, violently expelled the Jews from the city, and they fled to Seleucia. Five years after, the plague drove away all such as had been permitted to remain on account of connexions or for other special reasons. The Jews in Seleucia, to the number of fifty thousand, were some time after massacred. Those who escaped sought safety at Ctesiphon; but they felt so little assurance of permanent security here, that they removed to Ncerda and Nisibis.<sup>1</sup> This exasperation could hardly have subsided so much in the course of a few years, that the Jews would venture to return to Babylon.

But there were others to whom the instructions of the apostle might be addressed and would be acceptable. The *εὐσεβέστεροι*, or pious Gentiles, were everywhere more disposed to receive the doctrines of Christianity than the Jews. There were such in the East, as well as among the Greeks and Romans.<sup>2</sup>

Let us, however, look a moment at the Babylon in Egypt. Supposing Peter to have gathered a church here, or visited one already existing, in order to ascertain its doctrines and condition, and to regulate whatever required to be corrected and amended, we have an explanation of a fact which is stated in history. Mark, we are told (see § 75), went from Rome, where under Peter's guidance he had written his Gospel, to Egypt, and took charge of the Christian churches in that country. Now what is more natural, than that Mark should consider it his duty, after the death of Peter, to guide and uphold the churches which he had labored with Peter to establish or to regulate?

But, on the other hand, we meet with a difficulty in the circumstance, that according to Strabo's description of it, this Babylon was little more than a garrison, occupied by one of the three Roman legions which were quartered in Egypt.<sup>3</sup>

### § 173.

#### THE SECOND EPISTLE OF PETER AND THE EPISTLE OF JUDE.

The first Epistle of Peter had, besides its general destination, one more particular, to a certain church or to several which was or were under the direction of one Sylvanus, probably the same who was at one time Paul's travelling-companion. Peter had already written once before, and communicated instruction respecting some doubts upon doctrinal points (1 Pet. 5: 12); but of this letter nothing remains, not even a definite intimation as to the churches to which it was directed.

The apprehension which Peter felt as to the maintenance of pure doctrine was, however, becoming more and more well-grounded. False teachers gained the ascendancy, acquired adherents, and vexed the churches with heresies, while they were trembling at the horrors of Ne-

<sup>1</sup> Jos. Ant. L. XVIII. c. 9. n. 8. 9.

<sup>2</sup> Jos. B. Jud. L. II. c. 20. n. 2, and c. 18. n. 2. Contra Apion. L. II. c. 10.

<sup>3</sup> Strabo, Geogr. L. XVII. p. 535. Ima Casaub. and 2da Casaub. p. 807.

ro's persecution. There was, then, it would seem, no apostle in Asia Minor. Paul must have been still in the East, and John cannot have been then at Ephesus, since aid was sought at a distance. This absence of any authority that could restrain the heretics was naturally a great help to their endeavors; and they did not neglect to profit by it.

The second of the Epistles extant was directed to the same church or churches as the lost Epistle, which sustained the orthodoxy of Sylvanus and commended his fidelity under the circumstances of the time (1 Pet. 5: 12); and the same, also, to which the first of the Epistles extant was more especially directed. Peter calls this Epistle the second, *δεύτεραν ὑμῖν γράψαν ἐπιστολὴν* (2 Pet. 3: 1), and thus seems to have regarded the Epistle *διὰ Σιλvanou* as a private one, and Sylvanus as his agent, by whom he laid something before the church, without publishing to the world the letter itself, which may have contained some special communications.

The Epistle of Jude treats of the same errors, opposes the same persons, to which the 2d of Peter relates: Their occasion, therefore, their purpose, and destination must have been the same. Now, as the second of Peter was directed to Asia Minor, no other destination can be properly assigned to the Epistle of Jude. Persia, then, is out of the question, though it has been designated as the country to which it was sent.

The statement that this apostle wrote against the Magi and Persians is so far well-founded, that he opposed doctrines held by the Magi, but the supposition that he wrote against the Persians is the bold invention of a historical conjecturer, who gave to the truth an addition of his own.

Thus the Epistle of Peter remains our sole and a faithful guide in regard to the local destination of James' Epistle, if it be true that the similarity of two compositions, written not with general aims, but against particular doctrines and absurdities, necessarily supposes similar local and other circumstances as the occasion and foundation of both.

### § 174.

The contents of the second Epistle of Peter are as follows: Labor incessantly to advance in the knowledge of the blessed doctrine of Jesus, which produces every virtue, no one of which shall be unrewarded (—1: 12). I therefore exhort you anew; and, as an eye-witness of what Jesus did and taught, I can give you more accurate instruction than those who strive to mislead you by false representations (—2:).

False teachers have crept in among you, whose destruction is certain. God spared not even the disobedient angels; he has set before our eyes, as examples, the punishment of the whole world before the flood, as also particularly of Sodom and Gomorrah. Much more may they expect punishment, who give themselves up to every impurity, and speak evil of God and spiritual beings, which even the angels have never ventured to do in respect to beings inferior to them. Full of uncleanness and covetousness, they strive after lucre, like Balaam; they are windy clouds without water (—3:).

Remember the words of prophets and apostles, who have foretold the

coming of our Lord and the return of the earth to chaos when he shall appear as Judge. Hold yourselves in readiness, as Paul has already exhorted you.

### § 175.

Contents of the Epistle of Jude. There have crept in among you unawares certain men, long since ripe for destruction, who deny our Lord. Remember that God punished the Jews when they rebelled against him, and even the disobedient angels; Sodom and Gomorrah, too, he made a monument of chastisement for their abominations. These men, full of sensuality, revile God and spiritual beings, though Michael dared not revile even Satan. They thirst for gain like Balaam, perish like Korah, are windy clouds without water, raging waves of the sea. Enoch declared the judgment which awaits their wickedness. But remain ye firm in the faith and in love, in which may God confirm you.

### § 176.

The similarity of the second chapter of the 2d Epistle of Peter to the little composition of Jude is so great as to strike every one's attention. It does not, therefore, need proof; but the reason of it demands careful investigation.

Was it, then, Jude who borrowed from Peter? or did Peter use Jude's small composition in preparing his own? There is certainly little probability that Jude would have made use of foreign aid as to the ideas and phraseology of so brief a production as his, consisting of only twenty-five verses.

In instituting a comparison between the two, however, a sagacious observer cannot fail to perceive which is the original. The phraseology of Jude is simple, unlabored, and expressive without ornament; that of Peter is artificial, and wears the appearance of embellishment and amplification.

#### Jude v. 8.

Ὅμοίως μέντοι καὶ οὗτοι  
ἐνυπνιαζόμενοι, σάρκα  
μὲν μιαίνουσι, κυριότητα  
δὲ ἀθιτοῦσι, δόξας δὲ  
βλασφημοῦσιν.

#### Jude v. 10.

Οὔτοι δὲ, ὅσα μὲν οὐκ  
οἶδασι, βλασφημοῦσιν·  
ὅσα δὲ φυσικῶς, ὡς τὰ  
ἄλογα ζῶα, ἐπίστανται,  
ἐν τούτοις φθείρονται.

#### 2 Pet. 2: 10.

Μάλιστα δὲ τοὺς ὀπίσω σαρκὸς  
ἐν ἐπιθυμίᾳ μiasμοῦ πορευομένους  
καὶ κυριότητος καταφρονοῦντας.  
τολμηταί, ἀνθ' αὐαίς, δόξας οὐ  
τρέμουσι βλασφημοῦντες.

#### 2 Pet. 2: 12.

Οὔτοι δὲ, ὡς ἄλογα ζῶα φυσικά,  
γεγεννημένα εἰς ἄλωσιν καὶ  
φθοράν, ἐν οἷς ἀγνοοῦσι βλασφη-  
μοῦντες, ἐν τῇ φθορᾷ αὐτῶν  
καταφθαρήσονται.



## Jude v. 16.

Οὗτοι εἰσι . . . . κατὰ τὰς  
ἐπιθυμίας αὐτῶν πορευόμενοι .  
καὶ τὸ στόμα αὐτῶν  
λαλεῖ ὑπερόγκῃ.

## 2 Pet. 2: 18.

Ἐπείρογκα γὰρ ματαιότητος  
φθεγγόμενοι δελεάζουσιν ἐν  
ἐπιθυμίαις σαρκὸς, ἀσελείαις,  
τοὺς ὀλίγως ἀποφυγόντας τοὺς  
ἐν πλάνῃ ἀναστρεφόμενους.

In the following passage in Jude I have reversed the real order of the words. It is necessary that it should be read in this inverted manner, in order to make the parallelism more apparent.

## Jude v. 4.

Ἀρνούμενοι  
δεσπότην  
μετατιθέντες  
εἰς ἀσέλειαν  
ἀσεβεῖς, τὴν τοῦ Θεοῦ ἡμῶν χάριν  
εἰς τὸ κῆριμα  
προγεγραμμένοι  
πάσαι.

## 2 Pet. 2: 1, 2, 3.

Καὶ τὸν ἀγοράσαντα αὐτοὺς  
δεσπότην ἀρνούμενοι,  
ἐπάγοντες ἑαυτοῖς ταχινὴν  
ἀπώλειαν . . . .  
ταῖς ἀσελείαις,  
οὓς ἡ ὁδὸς τῆς ἀληθείας  
βλασφημηθήσεται . . . .  
οἷς τὸ κῆριμα  
ἐκπαλαί  
οὐκ ἀργεῖ, καὶ ἡ ἀπώλεια αὐτῶν  
οὐ νυσιάζει.

In the first passage, while Jude says simply, *σάρκα μιαίνουσι*, Peter has *ὀπίσω σαρκὸς ἐν ἐπιθυμίᾳ πορευόμενοι*—Jude *κυριότητα ἀθετοῦσι*, Peter *κυριότητος καταφρονοῦντες*, *τολμηταί*, *αὐθάδεις*—Jude *δόξας βλασφημοῦσι*, Peter *δόξας οὐ τρέμουσι βλασφημοῦντες*; in all which cases it is evident that Peter's expressions are circumlocutions and amplifications. It is just so with the other passages cited; they are moulded from the simple language of Jude to a more elegant form, are embellished with participles, and sometimes exhibit rhetorical amplifications.

If this observation be correct, and it is so obviously true that it will hardly be disputed, it is a natural inference, that Peter had the Epistle of Jude before him and applied it to his own purposes in his own way.<sup>1</sup>

Both, moreover, mention a controversy between angels and fallen spirits, conducted by the former with so much forbearance, that they

<sup>1</sup> It has been attempted to explain the similarity of Peter and Jude by supposing them to have made use of the same originals, such, e. g., as the book from which they derived the account of a dispute of the angels with inferior spirits. If the resemblance were limited to agreement in such matters of erudition, this supposition might hold good. But it extends, also, to the description of their contemporaries, to the picture they give of certain false teachers, and to the representation of their vices and errors, which they cannot well have drawn from previous sources. It extends even to the salutation in the two Epistles, which cannot have been borrowed from any common source: *χάρις ὑμῖν καὶ εἰρήνη πληθυνθείη*; and Jude: *ἔλεος ὑμῖν καὶ εἰρήνη* . . . *πληθυνθείη*.

did not revile even such opponents (2 Pet. 2: 11. Jude v. 9). In regard to the passage in Peter, we are told, it is true, that *κατ' αὐτῶν* may refer, not to spirits, to the preceding *δόξας*, but to the heretics. But how was it possible for the angels to commit blasphemy against them; and must it not, in that case, have been *πλάσματος χρίσις* for Jude and Peter to speak as they do of the wickedness of the heretics, for which, according to their statement, eternal damnation was not too severe a punishment?

This piece of erudition was not of such a nature that every reader could be supposed acquainted with it; it was at least not in the sacred books of the Jews, and could have been known to them only from other reading or from special communication. It was, therefore, necessary that it should be presented at length, or at least so definitely as to show what the writer intended and to what he alluded.

In Jude this is the case; he states the matter definitely, and expressly mentions the dispute of Michael with the devil about the body of Moses. But Peter is so very general in his language, and expresses himself so indefinitely on the subject, that we could not conjecture to what he referred, if we had not Jude in our possession. So it must have been with any one in ancient times, however well he might have been acquainted with the occurrence between the devil and the archangel. It must have been necessary that he should learn from another source to what the apostle alluded, in order to understand him.

The procedure of Peter in regard to this passage, therefore, shows that he presumed Jude to be already in the hands of his readers; that he thought it justifiable to suppose they would understand him fully without any necessity of greater minuteness or definiteness on his part.

### § 177.

Now, if the originality of Jude is clear from a comparison of the two writers, particularly from their phrasology, we are entitled to all such inferences from this fact as can be legitimately deduced from it.

It seems that Peter took, in his second letter to the churches of Asia Minor the same course as in his first. In the latter he chose Paul as his example, and under his guidance planned and executed his instructions to these churches, respecting which he had not much knowledge, making some use, also, of the Epistle of James; and in his second composition he guided himself by the Epistle of Jude, who had already attacked the heretics against whom he wished now to oppose his own authority in addition.

The style, too, of the second Epistle of Peter, is the same as that of the first. There is the same manner of appropriating the ideas and expressions of others, giving them certain slight alterations, sometimes embellishing them, setting them off with participles, and otherwise amplifying them.

This resemblance of the second Epistle of Peter to the first does not consist merely in certain modes of expression, such as any one who undertook to forge a composition in the name of another would naturally select and employ; but extends to the plan and private scheme of

the composition, to peculiarities in its execution, and to the ingenuity shown in preventing the attention from being arrested by whatever for special reasons it was necessary to borrow out of other writers. This resemblance, therefore, is not superficial but characteristic; and so thorough as to denote an identity of authorship. We find no difficulty in clearly recognising Peter, and perceive that the second Epistle is a genuine production of his mind.

But if this is not satisfactory, and we are required further to point out resemblances in phraseology, we are able to comply with the demand. A favorite word with Peter is *ἀναστρογή*, 1 Pet. 1: 15, 18. 2: 12. 3: 1, 2, 16; with which compare 2 Pet. 2: 7. 3: 12. *Ἀπόθεσις* is used by him alone, 1 Pet. 3: 21. 2 Pet. 1: 14. The word *ἀρετή*, is used it is true by Paul, for *moral excellence*, once at least (Philip. 4: 8), but it is used by Peter alone in the sense of *power*, 1 Pet. 1: 9. 2 Pet. 1: 3. Both Epistles use *ἀλήθεια* to denote Christian doctrines, 1 Pet. 1: 22. 2 Pet. 1: 12. The expressions, *κοιμιζόμενοι σπηρίαν*, 1 Pet. 1: 9, *κοιμῆσθε σιέθανον*, 5: 4, and *κοιμούμενοι μισθόν*, 2 Pet. 2: 13, have a similar signification in both Epistles. The expression, *ἐποπιεύσαντες*, 1 Pet. 2: 12. 3: 2, and *ἐπόπια γεννηθέντες*, 2 Peter 1: 16, borrowed from the mysteries, is peculiar to Peter. The words *ἄσπιλος* and *ἄμωμος* in connexion, 1 Pet. 1: 19, occur again together in 2 Pet. 3: 14, as likewise *σπίλοι* and *μῶμοι*, 2 Pet. 2: 13. *Χορηγέιν*, 1 Pet. 4: 11, and *ἐπιχορηγέιν*, 2 Pet. 1: 11, occur sometimes, though rarely, in Paul's writings. The expression *ἀκαταπαύστους ἁμαρτίας*, 2 Pet. 2: 14, bears analogy to *πέπανται ἁμαρτίας*, 1 Pet. 4: 1.

Relying on these grounds, I cannot consider the declaration of the writer that he was an eye-witness with others of Christ's transfiguration (2 Pet. 1: 16—19) as a mere literary artifice, designed to procure the composition an unmerited estimation. The more unobtrusive indications, as well as those obvious to the view of every one, appropriate the authorship of the second Epistle to the writer of the first.

But, if the second Epistle of Peter is genuine, that of Jude must be so too. It must not only be supposed to have existed in the days of the apostles, when Peter wrote his Epistle, but to have been written by some one whom the apostle esteemed worthy of being selected as his guide in opposing the errors and false teachers of countries which he had not seen himself, and concerning which he could only derive information from others.

We might, therefore, be satisfied as to the genuineness of these two writings on internal grounds, even if the historical argument and the testimonies of the ancients were less satisfactory.

### § 178.

We are not unmindful, however, that our positions are still endangered from another quarter. Not long since, the second Epistle of Peter met with an opponent, who menaced its dismemberment, and maintained his right to do this violence with learning and acuteness.<sup>1</sup> He separates it into three distinct portions, which happen to correspond with

<sup>1</sup> "Der zweyte Brief Petri kritisch untersucht," by Prof. Charles Ullmann, Heidelb. 1821, 8vo.

the present division into chapters. The first chapter he ascribes to Peter, and considers it to be one of his Epistles the conclusion of which was early lost, or perhaps a fragment of a long letter of which only the beginning has been preserved. This precious relic of the apostle was regarded by some unknown person as adapted to effect a well-meant purpose, and he added to it at different times the second and third chapters, intending to confound the heretics of the day by the great name at the commencement, or to preserve believers from their influence. The Epistle of Jude, with some alteration, afforded him materials for the second chapter, and he made some use of it likewise in the third.

But how happens it, then, that the first chapter contains preparatory references to the heretics who are the subject of the second and third? In these latter chapters they are charged with self-contrived doctrines, *πλαστοῖς λόγοις* (2: 3), by means of which they enlisted in their behalf the desire for dissolute pleasure, *ἐπιθυμία μiasμοῦ* (2: 10), and placed a lure in the way of others in order to procure adherents (2: 18); as they themselves, also, gave way to their lusts, *ἐν ἐπιθυμίαις πορευόμενοι* (3: 3). Their chief heresy consisted in denying the second coming of our Lord, *παρουσία*, to judge mankind, which they did for the purpose of removing every restraint upon licentiousness (3: 4. Comp. 3: 12).

Now at the very outset of the Epistle he warns against the corruption of lust, *ἀφουρόνιες—τῆς ἐν ἐπιθυμίᾳ φθορᾶς* (1: 4), and shortly after makes mention of cunningly-devised fables, *σεσοφισμένοις μύθοις* (1: 16), against which he opposes his authority; for he had been intimate with our Lord and a witness of his transfiguration on the mount, and possessed information concerning Christ more to be depended on than the statements of others, particularly concerning his second coming, *παρουσία*, and his power (1: 16—19). The *σεσοφισμένοι μύθοι* of the first chapter correspond to the *πλαστοῖς λόγοις* of the second; the *ἐπιθυμία φθορᾶς* to the *ἐπιθυμία μiasμοῦ*; and *παρουσία*, of course, to *παρουσία*. Ought we, then, to disunite what is so closely woven together by its author?

As the actual connexion is so clear, it would be of no consequence if the transition were rather abrupt, as is frequently the case with authors of little cultivation and experience. But this is by no means the case here. The teachers of the *theosophic* system in Asia Minor, of whom the false teachers referred to in this Epistle were probably a branch, pretended to be in possession of the means of procuring the power of prophecy (§ 131); in opposition to whom the author asserts that he had obtained a more sure knowledge of futurity, *βεβαιότερον προφητικὸν λόγον* (1: 19), and then proceeds to say, that prophecy, as presented in the Holy Scriptures, is not a matter for human interpretation, but must be explained from above (1: 20, 21). Thus there have been false prophets; and false teachers are now at hand, whose character will be as follows, etc. (2: 1 seq.). This is the train of thought through which he passes to the subsequent description of the heretics; nor do we perceive any interruption or chasm, such as usually betrays the junction of distinct writings.

The circumstance that Jude uses the word *παρεισέδυσαν*, they have



crept in, while Peter speaks of them as yet to come, should not create any difficulty; for it is evident, even from Jude, that they had not yet avowed themselves publicly and with unblushing front.

The third chapter has the same real connexion with what precedes, if not as plain a verbal connexion, as the second. The subject continues to be the false teachers. Jude had not yet finished speaking of them, nor consequently had Peter, who followed Jude. He makes the same use of Jude's Epistle as before.

## 2 Pet. 3: 2, 3.

Μνησθῆναι τῶν προειρημένων  
ῥημάτων  
ὑπὸ τῶν ἁγίων προφητῶν,  
καὶ τῆς τῶν ἀποστόλων  
ἡμῶν ἐντολῆς,  
τοῦ κυρίου καὶ σωτῆρος . . . .  
ἐλεύσονται  
ἐπ' ἐσχάτου τῶν ἡμερῶν  
ἐν ἐμπαιγμονῇ ἐμπαῖνται,  
κατὰ τὰς ἰδίας αὐτῶν  
ἐπιθυμίας πορευόμενοι.

## Jude, v. 17, 18.

Μνήσθητε τῶν ῥημάτων  
τῶν προειρημένων  
ὑπὸ τῶν ἀποστόλων  
τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ .  
. . . . .  
ἐν ἐσχάτῳ χρόνῳ  
ἔσονται  
ἐμπαῖνται,  
κατὰ τὰς ἑαυτῶν  
ἐπιθυμίας πορευόμενοι.

I must now notice some distinctive expressions of the first chapter, of which, short as it is, there are several that are repeated in the second and third chapters, and evince them to be the production of the same author. The word *φθορά*, which occurs in the first chapter, meaning moral corruption (1: 4), is found likewise in the second (2: 19, and shortly before, 2: 12), in the signification of destruction, *εἰς ἄλωσιν καὶ φθοράν*, and moreover in that of *moral corruption*, *ἐν τῇ φθορᾷ αὐτῶν φθαρησονται*. The unusual adjective form *ταχινή* is common to both chapters, *ταχινή ἀπόθεσις* (1: 14), and *ταχινή ἀπώλεια* (2: 1). In the first and third we find *ἐπάγγελμα* instead of *ἐπαγγελία* (1: 4, and 3: 13). So *κυρίου καὶ σωτῆρος* (1: 11, 3: 2 and 18). Whole phrases: *τοῦτο πρῶτον γινώσκοντες, ὅτι* . . . 1: 20, where no *second*, no *δεύτερον*, follows; and, in like manner: *τοῦτο πρῶτον γινώσκοντες, ὅτι* . . . 3: 3. And, still more striking: *διεγείρειν ὑμᾶς ἐν ὑπομνήσει* (1: 13) and *διεγείρω ὑμῶν ἐν ὑπομνήσει* (3: 1).

On the whole, I not only discover no necessity of separation, but perceive rather a fast connexion of the different parts, which renders the attempt to disunite them impracticable.

## § 179.

We find some passages in the earliest fathers of the church, which may be regarded as quotations by memory from the second Epistle of Peter, although their coincidence is not perfectly literal. Among these I rank the passage in the 2d Book of Theophilus against Autolycus, C. 9: *Οἱ δὲ τοῦ θεοῦ ἄνθρωποι καὶ πνευματοφόροι πνεύματος ἁγίου καὶ προφήται γενόμενοι, ὑπ' αὐτοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ ἐμπνευσθέντες καὶ σο-*

πισθεντες ἐγένοντο θεοδιδασκοι, Comp. 2 Pet. 1: 20. The clause, *Ὁ λόγος αὐτοῦ γαίνων ὥσπερ λύχνος ἐν σικηματι συνεχομένῳ* (B. II. C. 13), very much resembles Pet. 1: 19. *Ὁ λόγος ὡς λύχνος γαίνων ἐν αὐγμῇ ἰοπῳ*.

The quotation of Irenæus<sup>1</sup> is more explicit: "quoniam dies Domini sicut in ille anni—*ἡ γὰρ ἡμέρα κυρίου ὡς χίλια ἔτη*. True, the substance of these words is found elsewhere in the Bible (Ps. 89: 4), but under a very different form and application: *ὅτι χίλια ἔτη ἐν ὁφθαλμοῖς σου, ὡς ἡ ἡμέρα ἡ χθὲς, ἥτις διήλθε*. Only in 2 Pet. 3: 8, are found exactly as they occur in Irenæus.

Supposing what can hardly be denied, that this citation is identical with the passage in Peter and was derived from it, we may congratulate ourselves that we have a much earlier witness in favor of this Epistle, viz. Justin Martyr, who had already referred to the same passage.<sup>2</sup> After him comes Clement of Alexandria, who has made use of it frequently in his works. Let it not be objected, that the clause was probably a proverbial expression. It is not so treated by Peter: *ΕΝ δὲ τοῦτο*—let not this important truth escape you, that one day, etc.

The first, however, who speaks expressly of the 2d Epistle of Peter, is Origen; though he observes at the same time that it is disputed.<sup>3</sup>

Eusebius, in like manner, states that this Epistle had not come down to his time as a writing of the highest class (viz. those universally acknowledged), but, as it was found serviceable by many, the same use had been made of it as of the other books of the New Testament.<sup>4</sup>

Jerome acquaints us with one of the objections which were urged against the Epistle. He says it was denied to be Peter's because a difference in style was observed between it and the 1st Epistle,<sup>5</sup> an observation which is always uncertain, and not to be relied on in critical investigations, so long as it rests merely on feeling and taste and is not brought out to distinct intellectual perception and referred to principles of philosophical and particular grammar. If the fathers found no weightier difficulty than this, the remarks which we have already made will afford ample indemnification for their doubt.

The most ancient Syriac version does not at present contain the Epistle; but Ephraem cites it, both in his Syriac and Greek works.<sup>6</sup>

Descending into the fourth century, we find it treated by the Christian fathers generally with the same consideration as other biblical writings, and invariably comprised in catalogues of the canonical books.

Still, the historical evidence in the case will not afford us that satisfaction which we like to have on subjects of this nature; and, even if we call to our aid the established and immemorial usage according to which this Epistle possessed from the remotest period a place in the biblical codex, we shall, notwithstanding, find it necessary to resort to internal evidence in order to arrive at a definite decision respecting the genuineness of this Epistle.

<sup>1</sup> Iren. L. V. Adv. Hær. C. 23.

<sup>2</sup> Dial. cum Tryph. c. 81.

<sup>3</sup> Euseb. H. E. I. VI. c. 25.

<sup>4</sup> Euseb. H. E. III. 3.

<sup>5</sup> Hieronym. Script. Eccles. v. Petrus.

<sup>6</sup> Opp. Syr. T. II. p. 342. Opp. Græc. T. II. p. 387.

## § 180.

The Epistle of Jude, notwithstanding its brevity, has weighty testimonies of antiquity in its favor. The Gnostic teachers endeavored to make it support their opinions, and, in particular, explained the 8th verse as favoring their extravagant theory of morals. The Christian father to whom we are indebted for this information mentions by name, at the commencement of his treatise on this sect, the works of their own from which he derived his knowledge, writing therefore from authentic sources.<sup>1</sup>

Among the orthodox Greek fathers, Clement of Alexandria cites the Epistle under Jude's name, as the production of a prophetic mind.<sup>2</sup>

Origen calls the Epistle a production full of heavenly grace.<sup>3</sup> In his book *Περὶ ἀρχῶν*, he even inclines to ascribe indubitable authority to the work *Ascensio Moysi*, because he supposed that Jude cites it in his Epistle.<sup>4</sup> Still, it is manifest from one of his expressions, that many of his contemporaries disagreed with him, and entertained some doubt respecting the authority of the Epistle. His pupil Pamphilus, however, the estimable teacher of Eusebius, makes use of it without any scruple.<sup>5</sup>

Notwithstanding, Eusebius does not conceal from us that his predecessors were divided in opinion respecting it, and that it is not to be ranked among the universally-acknowledged writings.<sup>6</sup>

The case was the same, also, in the Syriac church. Its version, the Peschito, does not now contain it; but once, it would seem, the case was different; for Ephraem shows that he was acquainted with it, and does not scruple to allow it the authority of a biblical book.<sup>7</sup>

The oldest catalogue among the Latins, the one given by the anony-

<sup>1</sup> Epiphan. Adv. Hær. L. I. T. II. H. XXVI. no. 13. Pet. and Ed. Basil. p. 45. *Βοίλονται γὰρ τὴν καὶ αὐτῶν μαρτυρίαν τὴν ἀπὸ τῆς ἐπιστολῆς τοῦ Ἰούδα μᾶλλον εἰς αὐτοὺς διῆθαι ἐπάγασθαι, ἐν τῷ λέγειν, καὶ οἱ μὲν ἐνυπνιαζόμενοι σάρκα μιαίνουσι . . . Οὐκ εἶπε δὲ ὁ μακάριος Ἰούδας, ἀδελφὸς τοῦ κυρίου, περὶ ἐνυπνιαζομένων ἐν σώμασιν, κ. τ. λ.*

<sup>2</sup> L. III. Strom. c. 2. p. 431. Sylb. *Ἐπὶ τούτων οἶμαι καὶ τῶν ὁμοίων αἱρέσεων προφητικῶς Ἰούδαν ἐν τῇ ἐπιστολῇ εἰρηκέναι.* Comp. Pædag. L. III. c. 8.

<sup>3</sup> Comment. in Matth. XIII. p. 223. *Ἰούδας ἐγραψεν ἐπιστολὴν ὀλιγόστιχον μὲν, πεπληρωμένην δὲ τῶν τῆς ἐπουρανίου χάριτος λόγων.*

<sup>4</sup> L. III. c. 2. "De quo in Ascensione Moysi, cujus libelli meminit in Epistolâ suâ apostolus Judas, Michael archangelus cum diabolo disputans de corpore Moysi, ait, a diabolo inspiratum serpentem causam extitisse prævaricationis Adæ," etc.

<sup>5</sup> Comment. in Matth. Vol. III. p. 488. Opp. Orig. Ruci; and Apolog. pro Origen. Vol. IV. p. 23.

<sup>6</sup> Euseb. H. E. L. III. c. 25.

<sup>7</sup> Opp. Syr. T. I. p. 136. Hassencamp's "Anmerk. zu Michaelis' Einleit." p. 42—44.

mous writer in Muratori, expressly mentions this Epistle as an admitted biblical book.<sup>1</sup>

Tertullian, in speaking of Enoch, refers to the Epistle of Jude, and designates its author by the epithet apostle.<sup>2</sup>

There were, however, some among the Latins also, at a later and perhaps too at an earlier period, who refused to acknowledge this Epistle; but this circumstance did not exert any influence upon the mass of the Latins. In the time of Jerome, it was ranked with the other Sacred Scriptures, on account of its antiquity and immemorial use.<sup>3</sup>

The principal objection to which it was subject was, that it referred to an apocryphal production, the book of Enoch. For, as on that account some considered the book of Enoch and the *Ascensio Mosis* to be authoritative scriptural books, others, on the contrary, denied the writer's apostolical rank and inspiration, because he encumbered his Epistle with apocryphal accounts. This we are told by Didymus of Alexandria, and, among the Latins, by Jerome.<sup>4</sup>

### § 181.

Who was this Jude? If James, the brother of our Lord, and James the son of Alphæus, the apostle, were one and the same person, so likewise were Jude, the brother of our Lord, and the Jude mentioned in the list of apostles. But supposing there were two of this name, to which Jude does the Epistle belong?

Our author calls himself *ἀδελφὸς Ἰακώβου*, the brother of James. He either does this to designate the family to which he belonged, and thereby individualize himself to the reader; or he wished to exalt and support his authority by means of his relationship to James, a celebrated Christian teacher.

But he does not thereby distinguish his family; for each Jude had a brother named James, and consequently the name of the writer's brother does not at all enlighten us respecting his family connexions or himself.

The other reason, then, must be the true one, why he subjoined the name of his brother. But relationship to James the apostle could not confer upon Jude the apostle any recommendation which he did not already possess. We find no mention in the biblical history of any thing which rendered him widely known or distinguished him above others; we only observe his name by the side of Jude's in the catalogue of the apostles.

Let us suppose that James, the brother of our Lord, is meant. We know that he was honored as the Just and Wise, and that his name was noised abroad in many countries. Those who defended and inculcated the observances of the law had rendered him celebrated in Galatia and

<sup>1</sup> T. III. Ant. It. p. 854.

<sup>2</sup> De cult. fœm. c. 4. "Eo accedit, quod Enoch apud Judam apostolum testimonium possidet."

<sup>3</sup> In Catal. v. Judas. "Tamen auctoritatem vetustate et usu meruit, et inter Sanctas Scripturas computatur."

<sup>4</sup> Didym. apud Fabric. Cod. Pseudepigr. Vet. Test. p. 846. Hieron. in Catal. v. Jud.



Achaia, and his fame was extended far and wide in Asia, through the decision of the council at Jerusalem, which was occasioned by his influence. Moreover, he was honored by all Jewish Christians on account of the high station which he held as principal teacher at Jerusalem. The lustre of his name would be reflected upon his brother, and the distinction of the former would procure special estimation for the latter. In this case Jude might well think it of consequence to connect his own name with that of his brother, thus at once designating and dignifying himself.

Jude, moreover, does not call himself an apostle; and yet it was incumbent upon him to show by what right he undertook to pronounce and prescribe on points of Christian doctrine. He calls himself, exactly as James does, *the servant of Jesus Christ*, Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ δοῦλος, which appellation must have implied more than that of apostle, or he would have called himself an apostle; for the expression, *servant of Jesus Christ*, as applicable to all the adherents of Christianity, could not procure him any more estimation as a teacher than belonged to the most ordinary Christian. If it has such a peculiar sense as to distinguish Jude, it must signify a nearer relation to Jesus than that of apostle.

Clement, therefore, was right in observing, in his Adumbrations, that "Jude, who wrote the Catholic Epistle, one of the sons of Joseph, a pious man, although he well knew his relationship to Jesus, yet did not call himself his brother; but said, Jude the servant of Jesus Christ (as the Lord) and the brother of James."<sup>1</sup>

### § 182.

We must now inquire concerning the heretics against whom Peter and Jude wrote their two Epistles. That they denied our Lord, is the principal charge made against them by the two apostles; and yet they were numbered among the Christians, and joined in their assemblies (Jude, v. 10). By this denial, therefore, we are not to understand that they had entirely renounced Christ and his followers; but that, in literal accordance with the charges made against them, they merely would not acknowledge Jesus as δεσπότην: τον ἀγοράσαντα αὐτοῦς δεσπότην ἀγορεύμενοι (2 Pet. 2: 1), καὶ τὸν μόνον δεσπότην καὶ κύριον ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν ἀγορεύμενοι (Jude, v. 4) i. e. they either denied that he was the Creator of the world, or that he was its governor and judge, or both together, as some had before denied that Jesus was the Christ, the Son of God: ἀγορεύμενοι ὅτι Ἰησοῦς ἐστὶν ὁ Χριστός, κ. τ. λ. It is clear that they disputed his government of the world and his office as judge, παρουσίαν (2 Pet. 3: 4—12), on which account they are even referred to the book of Enoch, which had long ago declared his judicial power (Jude, 14 seq.).

They had, moreover, circulated very erroneous ideas in regard to spiritual beings, and such as were inconsistent with their exalted character.

<sup>1</sup> "Judas, qui Catholicam scripsit Epistolam, frater filiorum Joseph, extans valde religiosus, cum sciret propinquitatem Domini, non tamen dixit, se ipsum fratrem ejus esse: sed quid dixit? Judas, servus Jesu Christi, utpote Domini, fratrem autem Jacobi." Opp. Clem. T. II. p. 1007. Ed. Venet.

The names by which these spirits are here designated are *δόξαι* and *χυριότητες*. The latter expression is sometimes used by Paul, in speaking of the different orders of spirits as classified by the theurgical teachers of Asia Minor (Eph. 1: 21. Col. 1: 16).

However great may have been their theoretical errors, they were trifling in comparison with the unnatural profligacy of their conduct. They had, besides, a reckless covetousness, to which nothing was too dear or too sacred to be sacrificed.

But it will be perceived that the description of these heretics and heresies is not by any means so definite as to enable us to distinguish at once the particular class to which it refers. Apparently their system was similar to that theurgical and magian philosophy, which we have described above, and which was distinguished for its pneumatological speculations about angels and spiritual beings and the inferences which it deduced from them.

We shall not probably meet with much opposition so long as we confine ourselves to so general a position as this. Some, however, suppose that reference is had to the sect of the Nicolaitans, which was already in a flourishing condition; and their opinion is neither improbable nor incompatible with the expressions of the two apostles, so far as we have any certain knowledge concerning this sect. But this investigation, if pursued with critical assiduity, would lead to much prolixity and to many accessory inquiries which we have not sufficient materials to discuss properly, and for which, moreover, this is not the proper place.<sup>1</sup>

### § 183.

The singular circumstance, that the Epistle of Jude allows argumentative authority to the book of Enoch, has led both the ancients and the moderns to very erroneous opinions and conclusions, sometimes to the prejudice of the Epistle and sometimes in favor of the book of Enoch. This state of things has resulted in part respecting this Epistle, and wholly in respect to the second of Peter, from the fact that the dispute

<sup>1</sup> The reasons at present urged by those who fix on the Nicolaitans are, I believe, the following. In the Apocalypse John describes the Nicolaitans nearly as these heretics are represented, using the same comparison and making the same charges: Men that practise the arts of Balaam, who taught Balak to ensnare the children of Israel, so that they ate of idolatrous sacrifices and committed fornication (Rev. 2: 14. Jud. 11. 2 Pet. 2: 15). In derivation, too, *Νικόλαοι* corresponds to *Νικόλαος*. Moreover, they certainly denied that our Lord was the creator and governor of the world: "Alterum quidem fabricatorem, alium autem patrem Domini . . . et eam conditionem, quæ est secundum nos, non a primo Deo factam, sed a virtute aliquâ valde deorsum subjectâ" (Iren. L. III. c. 11.) Now, if all corporeal and material existence had its origin from the creator of the world, a very imperfect and gross spirit, it naturally follows that it will not receive from the highest spirit, or Jesus, a corporeal resurrection to a general judgment. In regard to the spiritual world they did in truth teach such absurdities that one cannot help saying of them—*δόξας βλασφημονοι*—for they supposed that there were "*æones quosdam turpitudinis natos, et complexus, et permixtiones execrables et obscenas.*" (Tertull. in append ad Lib. De Præscrip. c. 46). The statements of the ancients, too, in regard to their profligacy and their detestable course of life are so consonant with each other and with the charges of the apostles, that the two Epistles may be pertinently considered as referring to them.

of the archangel with Satan concerning the body of Moses is cited in both by way of example and reproof. The more impartial judges in this case regarded these two arguments or specimens of erudition as mere fables, which they really are, and consequently they usually decided against the Epistles

The book of Enoch was, in fact, full of Judæo-theurgical and Magian reveries, as was natural from the character of the man who is supposed to have composed it. According to Eupolemus, he was the inventor of astrology, or rather a pupil of the angels in this science, who initiated him into its mysteries.<sup>1</sup> He once went on a mission to the angels,<sup>2</sup> on which occasion he probably enjoyed their instruction. But, not content with knowing the course of the planets, the position of the heavenly bodies, and their signification, he likewise, as is asserted by the Jews and other oriental people, became acquainted with the art of divination, with written signs, with offerings, purifications, lustrations, and other things of the kind, by instruction from celestial beings, and communicated them to men.<sup>3</sup>

From these notions of him, entertained by Jews, Arabians and others, we may readily judge to what species of literature his writings belonged. The fragments of them which we find in the fathers will not belie our judgment.

The larger fragments in Syncellus acquaint us with the names of the principal angels, and concerning other spirits and genii and their various occupations.<sup>4</sup> The earlier intimations and notices respecting the contents of this work point to the same subjects. Tertullian says: It has furnished us a classification of spiritual beings. In another place he has extracted from it warnings against the seductions of wicked demons and reprobate spirits. According to the book of Enoch, it was the angels that brought to light the secret virtue of plants, the abstruse operations of nature, and the riches of the earth, viz. its precious metals, and endued mankind with knowledge of this description.<sup>5</sup> It was they, we are assured by Clement of Alexandria on the authority of the book of Enoch, who brought down to us the science of the stars, the art of divination, and other useful arts.<sup>6</sup>

All the more ancient intimations in regard to this book or its supposed author likewise lead us to the same conclusion. Such was the idea which prevailed respecting the work and the character of the writer.<sup>7</sup> The book probably contained all the knowledge of the stars

<sup>1</sup> Apud Euseb. *De Præp. Evang.* L. IX. c. 17. p. 419. Ed. Vigeri.

<sup>2</sup> Irenæus, L. IV. *Adv. Hær.* c. 16.

<sup>3</sup> Abulpharagii *Hist. Dynast.* I. p. 9, 10. Arabic text. A great deal on this subject has been collected by Kircher in his "*Obeliscus Pamphilus*" L. I. c. 3. Wetstein on *Jud.* 14. in his *N. T.*

<sup>4</sup> Syncelli *Chronogr.* p. 11 seq. 24 seq. Edit. Goar.—Grabe, *Spic. Patr.* T. I. p. 347 seq.

<sup>5</sup> Tertull. *De Habitu mulier.* c. 3. *De Idololat.* c. 4 and 15. *De cultu fœminar.* c. 10.

<sup>6</sup> *Ex Script. Prophetar. Eclogæ.* c. LIII. p. 1002. Ed. Ven.

<sup>7</sup> Grabe, *Spicileg. S. S. P. P.* Tom. I. p. 344—358.—Fabric: *Cod. Apocr. V. Test.* P. I. p. 160—224. P. II. 55—60. Scaliger ad Euseb. *Chronic.* p. 244 seq. Concerning an Ethiopic Book of Enoch, see Michaelis' *Orient. Biblioth. Thl.* 6. p. 224 seq.

and their courses which was acquired in the time of Adam and Seth, and which, as we are informed by Josephus (*Antiq. L. I. c. 2. n. 3*), was engraven by Seth upon two monuments, one of stone and the other of brick, that they might survive the two great devastations of the earth which were foretold by Adam, one of which was to be effected by water and the other by fire. The whole character of the book justifies this supposition. The second desolation by fire yet awaits the world. (See 2 Pet. 3: 10—13.)

So too, whether the dispute between Michael and the devil about the body of Moses, which the ancients read in the book *Ἀνάβασις Μωσέως*, arose from the claim set up by the evil spirit to the body,<sup>1</sup> or in some other way, it is sufficient that the idea of a contest between good and evil spirits is at the foundation of it, and points us, in this case likewise, to theurgical opinions and teachers.

And now, why did the apostles cite these books, these examples and proofs? Naturally, in order to make those against whom they wrote sensible of their errors and criminality. Arguments and confutation drawn from the genuine sacred scriptures would have been of no avail against them, for these they evaded, as Peter complains expressly (2 Pet. 3: 16), by their perversions and forced interpretations, *τὰς γραφὰς στρεβλοῦσιν*. Thus, there was no surer means of influencing them, than those writings which they valued as the sources of their peculiar views and tenets. Nothing could more effectually reduce them to silence and shame them in the eyes of their contemporaries, than to be confuted by means of the very arguments on which they relied. This remark will not only exculpate the apostles, but convince us that in such a situation, with such antagonists, they could have done nothing more suitable or considerate than the very thing for which some have depreciated and disputed their two Epistles.

#### THE APOCALYPSE OF ST. JOHN.

##### § 184.

The writer calls himself John, and states the isle of Patmos to have been the place where these revelations were made to him. We will not long defer the inquiry, what John the testimony of antiquity designates as the author. But first, a few words only concerning the place where these visions were shown to him. For a question has been started, whether, in a completely poetical work like this, the author's statement of the place which was the scene of his visions, can claim a historical acceptance?

The case is not unique; and, if we may judge from other examples in antiquity, we can readily answer the inquiry. No one has ever deemed untrue what Hesiod relates, in his poem of Works and Days (v. 630—638), of his birth-place and his removal to Bœotia. Are we to

<sup>1</sup> Fabric. Cod. Apoc. V. T. P. I. p. 402 and 840—848.—Scholia in Ep. Jud. p. 238, 239. Ed. Nov. Test. C. F. Matthæi.



regard what Ovid says of his banishment to Tomos, what Phædrus, the fabulist, and Martial, the epigrammatist, tell us of the circumstances of their lives, as mere fiction, because it is stated in poetry? To pass from profane to sacred writings, have we any doubt respecting the account of Ezekiel in the introduction to his prophecies: It came to pass in the thirtieth year, when I was by the river Chebar, etc. Do we refuse to admit the statements concerning the circumstances of his life, which Jeremiah has interspersed here and there in his prophecies? If, now, we credit the removal of Hesiod, the transportation of Ezekiel to the river Chebar, and Ovid's banishment, why should we not credit the banishment of John?

Supposing it had been the writer's intention to exercise the license of poetry in this point, what reason can be assigned, why in his poetical revery he should transport himself to a barren rock almost unnoticed by the ancients, which first came into repute on account of the Apocalypse? Why did he not select a picturesque spot for his raptures? or one famed for former revelations, and consecrated by some momentous occurrence? Had this been the case, there would have been reason for the question, what is the respective share of poetry and truth in the representation? In examining his words, we find nothing but plain, unequivocal prose: I John, who also am your brother and companion in tribulation, and in the kingdom and patience of Jesus Christ, was in the isle that is called Patmos, for the word of God and for the testimony of Jesus Christ." This he says before any elevated state of mind is mentioned. It is not till after this declaration that he says: *ἐγενόμην ἐν πνεύματι*, I was in the spirit, etc. (1: 10). The contrary, therefore, is clear from every point of view; and we need not any longer delay the inquiry, what John was the author.

We are told that some, who had themselves seen John the Evangelist, stated, in regard to a doubtful reading in the Apocalypse (viz. the number of the beast, 13: 18), that the number six hundred and sixty-six was to be read; and that they were supported on this point by Mss. which even in the second century were accounted ancient.<sup>1</sup> We will pass by the fact that, as appears from this account, the superscriptions of ancient Mss. ascribed the book to John. It is weighty evidence, however, if contemporaries ascribe a production to a certain man; and still more so, if this is done by the acquaintances of a writer, and they are even able to state, as to a remarkable passage in which copies differ, what the author really wrote.

Nor could any thing be objected against the evidence, had not he through whom the account has come to us given himself up too carelessly in a like case to the representations of witnesses unworthy of reliance. There were some of the Gnostic sect, who asserted that our Lord, after living thirty years in obscurity, taught but a single year, and then died. He very properly objected to this statement, that we find in the

<sup>1</sup> "Omnibus antiquis et probatissimis et veteribus scripturis numero hoc posito, et testimonium perhibentibus his, qui facie ad faciem Joannem viderunt, καὶ μαρτυρούντων αὐτῶν ἐκείνων τῶν κατ' ὄψιν τὸν Ἰωάννην ἐωραχότων . . . quoniam numerus nominis bestię, secundum Græcorum computationem, per litteras, quę in eo sunt, sexcentos habet et sexaginta sex." (Iren. L. V. Adv. Hær. c. 30.—Euseb. H. E. L. IV. c. 24.)

Gospel three passovers during his ministry after his baptism, which certainly make more than one year. But he proceeds to say, that Jesus was more than thirty years old—that he was even forty or fifty—referring, not merely in behalf of the first statement, but in behalf of the highest number of years, to the testimony of such as had lived in the time of John, and been intimately acquainted with him.<sup>1</sup>

He probably relied too much in this case upon Papias, who wrote down indiscriminately all that he heard from men of the time of the apostles, whether true or false, and who deserved but a very circumspect reliance as to such points.

Next in order to the contemporaries of the apostles comes Papias himself. His writings have all perished, with the exception of a few fragments; but commentators, particularly Andrew of Cappadocia, who had in his possession many documents and writings on the subject of the Apocalypse which are now lost, reckon him among the explicit witnesses in its favor.<sup>2</sup>

It is true, it has been attempted to cast suspicion on the statement of the Cappadocian Bishop, on the ground that he also numbers Gregory Theologus among the friends of the Apocalypse, while no reason for so doing appears in Gregory's works. But the hastiness of this charge has been shown in such a manner,<sup>3</sup> that it can occasion no further difficulty. Moreover, no one, who is aware how much Irenæus relied upon Papias, will easily be persuaded that the former would have pronounced with so much confidence in regard to this book, had the latter been of a different opinion.

We have an illustrious voucher for the Apocalypse in Justin Martyr, who ascribes it to *John, one of the Apostles of our Lord*.<sup>4</sup> Next comes Theophilus of Antioch, who, particularly in his book against Hermogenes, drew many of his arguments from it.<sup>5</sup>

Melito, Bishop of Sardis, one of the seven churches to which a letter with special admonitions is addressed in the Apocalypse, composed a work exclusively upon this book. Eusebius mentions his literary productions as follows: *Μελίτωνος καὶ τὰ περὶ τοῦ διαβόλου καὶ τῆς ἀποκαλύψεως Ἰωάννου* (L. IV. c. 26. H. E.). Semler endeavors to persuade us from these words, that the books concerning the devil and the Apocalypse were one and the same, and then draws such inferences as his

<sup>1</sup> Irenæus, L. II. Adv. Hær. c. 22. n. 5. *Πάντες οἱ πρεσβύτεροι μαρτυροῦσιν, οἱ κατὰ τὴν Ἀσίαν Ἰωάννη τῷ τοῦ κυρίου μαθητῇ συμβεβληκότες, παραδεδοκέναι ταῦτα Ἰωάννην.*

<sup>2</sup> *Περὶ μέντοι τοῦ Θεοπνεύστου τῆς βίβλου περιττὸν μηχανεῖν τὸν λόγον ἡγοῦμεθα, τῶν μακαρίων, Γρηγορίου φημὶ, τοῦ Θεολόγου, καὶ Κυρίλλου, προσέτι δὲ καὶ τῶν ἀρχαιοτέρων, Παππίου, Εὐρηναίου, Μεθοδίου, καὶ Ἰππολίτου ταύτῃ προσμαρτυροῦντων τὸ ἀξιόπιστον.* Andr. Prol. in Apoc. inter Opp. Chrysost. in N. T. Tom. II. Frontodue. Francof. p. 175).

<sup>3</sup> Christ. Fried. Schmid, "Ob die Offenb. Joh. ein göttliches Buch ist?" Leipsic, 1777, p. 352, and Hist. Canon. L. II. p. 1. Sect. 4. § 166.

<sup>4</sup> Dial. cum Tryph. c. LXXXI. p. 308. Steph. *Ἰωάννης, εἰς τῶν ἀποστόλων Χριστοῦ, ἐν ἀποκαλύψει γενομένη αὐτῷ.*

<sup>5</sup> Euseb. H. E. L. IV. c. 24.

position affords him. But, not to mention that, if Melito had disputed the book, Eusebius would not have omitted to notice so important a circumstance, Melito himself calls it the Apocalypse of John. Jerome, however, in his Literary History (voc. Melito), explicitly distinguishes two works, "De diabolo librum unum, de Apocalypsi Joannis librum unum."

At the close of the second and beginning of the third century, we meet with Apollonius, a learned Presbyter of the church at Ephesus, who testifies in favor of the Apocalypse.<sup>1</sup> He lived in the very place whence a denial must have first proceeded, had the attempt been made to ascribe to the apostle a work which improperly bore his authoritative name. Ephesus boasted the residence and instruction of this estimable father; it contained his ashes, and his pupils after him were members of the Presbyterium. Moreover, the Apocalypse contains a special letter to this church, which gave it a peculiar interest in the book, and may be regarded as a dedication.

At the close of the third century and commencement of the fourth, Methodius, Bishop of Olympus in Lycia, and subsequently of Tyre, appears as a witness. We are still in possession of extracts from his commentaries on the Apocalypse, in the works of Andrew of Cappadocia. Photius has given us sketches of some of his works, in which he sometimes expressly referred to the Apocalypse of St. John.<sup>2</sup>

In the fourth century Ephraem the Syrian is specially worthy of notice among the Asiatics, as ascribing the Apocalypse to John, and moreover to John Theologus.<sup>3</sup>

From this time forth, however, we observe a different opinion among the bishops of Asia, the causes and occasions of which must be elucidated by other events, to which we shall hereafter direct our attention.

We will now leave this quarter of the world, and turn to Africa, there to trace the fortunes of the Apocalypse. Its first reception here was not less favorable than in Asia. Clement of Alexandria regarded its declarations as important and gracious communications of apostolic opinions, and itself as a work of John.<sup>4</sup>

Further west in Africa, Tertullian speaks with decided confidence in its favor: Inquire, says he, through the whole series of bishops, up to John himself, and each, without exception, declares John to have been its author.<sup>5</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Euseb. H. E. L. V. c. 18. *Κέχρηται δὲ καὶ μαρτυρίαις ἀπὸ τῆς Ἰωάννου Ἀποκαλύψεως, καὶ νεκρὸν δὲ δυνάμει θείᾳ πρὸς αὐτοῦ Ἰωάννου ἐν τῇ Ἐφέσῳ ἐγγεῖρθαι ἱστορεῖ . . .*

<sup>2</sup> Photius, Cod. 234. p. 489. Hæschel. *Καὶ ὁ μακάριος Ἰωάννης . . . Ἐδωκεν ἡ θάλασση τοὺς νεκροὺς ἐν αὐτῇ . . . κ. τ. λ.* Cod. 237. p. 508. *"Οὐ τὰ πλεῖστα τῆς τοῦ ἁγίου Ἰωάννου Ἀποκαλύψεως ῥητὰ εἰς τὴν ἐκκλησίαν καὶ τὰς παρθενοῦσας ψυχὰς ἀνάγει.*

<sup>3</sup> Opp. Syr. T. II. p. 332. T. III. p. 636. Opp. Græc. T. II. p. 252. *Καθὼς καὶ Ἰωάννης ὁ θεόλογος ἐκήρυξε.* Compt. T. III. p. 52. Hassen-camp's Anmerk. zu Michaelis Einleit. p. 9, 13.

<sup>4</sup> *Τὸ περίοπτον τῆς ἀποστολικῆς φωνῆς αἰνίττεσθαι χάριτος.* Pædag. L. II. c. 12. Strom. L. VI. c. 13. alibi.

<sup>5</sup> L. IV. Adv. Marcion. c. 5. *"Habemus et Joannis alumnos ecclesias.*

Origen regarded it as a work of John the Evangelist, and, although in speaking of the second and third of his Epistles, and of the other Catholic Epistles (e. g. that of Jude, which Origen considered canonical), he has always mentioned the doubts entertained respecting them, he does not seem to have known that the Apocalypse was at all disputed.<sup>1</sup>

It was about this time that Nepos, Bishop of the Arsinoitic Prefecture, assailed the allegorical interpretations of the Bible, with particular reference to the Apocalypse, from the literal exposition of which he thought he could prove the doctrine of a Millenium, which he held. The Apocalypse, therefore, was not then numbered among the writings whose uncertain authority rendered them unsuitable to establish a doctrinal point. He even based his positions on this in particular.<sup>2</sup>

Till now all was favorable to the Apocalypse; but the opinion of Nepos excited attention, and his work (*Ἐλεγχος ἀλληγοριστῶν*) gained adherents, who became so numerous that several churches were divided into two parties. On the death of Nepos a person named Koracion adopted his tenets, and vigorously maintained the thousand years' reign.

When the disagreement came to a high pitch of violence, Dionysius occupied the Alexandrian see. He brought about a *Colloquium*, which, unlike most others, proved satisfactory to all parties. He gave an account of this in a work which he entitled, *Περὶ ἐπαγγελιῶν*, *On the promises*, and in which he attempted to depreciate the Apocalypse, the main support of the doctrine of Nepos. He did this, however, with much moderation, that he might not offend those who had so readily agreed to a compromise.

It was amidst these disputes concerning the Millenium, that the first explicit and well-authenticated denial of the Apocalypse occurred; and it is related by Eusebius in Dionysius' own words, taken from his book *On the Promises*. When the head of the Alexandrian church enters into a critical investigation respecting the Apocalypse, we have a right to expect something unusually thorough upon the subject.

Dionysius refers first to earlier teachers, *τινὲς μὲν οὖν τῶν πρὸ ἡμῶν*, who had rejected the Apocalypse. "They maintained," he says, "that the title was deceptive; that it was not written by an apostle, nor even by any pious man, but by Cerinthus. They went through it chapter by chapter, in order to prove that it was a work without sense or connexion, a nobody-knew-what behind a thick veil of unintelligibility. Cerinthus, they said, composed it, in order to procure his heresies

Nam etsi Apocalypsin ejus Marcion respuit, ordo tamen episcoporum ad originem recensens, in Joannem stabit auctorem.

<sup>1</sup> Euseb. H. E. L. VI. c. 25. Particular passages from Origen may be found in Schmid's "Ob die Offenb. Johan. ein göttlich Buch sey." p. 257—275.

<sup>2</sup> Δόξας γοῦν οὗτος ἐκ τῆς ἀποκαλύψεως Ἰωάννου τὴν ἰδίαν κρατίνειν ὑπόληψιν ἔλεγχον ἀλληγοριστῶν, λόγον τινὰ περὶ τοῦτου συντάξας, ἐπέγραψεν. Euseb. H. E. L. VII. c. 24.



consequence by an apostolic name ; for it teaches, like him, an earthly reign of Christ in the midst of banqueting and sensual pleasures."

Now, who were these earlier teachers ? He does not make use of the expression ἀρχαῖοι ἄνδρες, or οἱ ἀπ' ἀνέκαθεν πρεσβύτεροι, the ancients, men in the beginning, from the earliest times, but merely says : some of our predecessors, *τινὲς τῶν πρὸ ἡμῶν*. These words, in their proper and customary sense, do not denote any great antiquity, and refer no further back than to the preceding generation. The circumstance, that Origen mentions no opposition to this book, which he has never forgotten to notice in regard to any of the disputed books, and the confidence with which Nepos based his favorite tenet upon it, will not permit us to suppose any other adversaries than those raised up against it by Nepos, in the heat of controversy respecting the Millennium.

Moreover, it is worthy of attention how they themselves represented the *status questionis*. They did not dispute the antiquity of the book, but rather admitted that it belonged to the times of the apostles, and ascribed it to an author who was contemporary with John. In their view, the only question was : Was this book written by John, the apostle, or by his adversary Cerinthus, the heretic ?

They adopted the latter position, and expected to prove it from the similarity between the opinions of Cerinthus and those expressed in the Apocalypse. He imagined, in his sensual way of thinking, said they, that there would be a reign of Christ upon earth, in which men would enjoy themselves in banqueting, revelling, and other gross pleasures—as is taught in the Apocalypse.

They gave to the Apocalypse, it seems, that anti-allegorical sense and literal interpretation, which was affixed to it by Nepos ; a gross, material signification.<sup>1</sup> When, therefore, they met with an opponent who discarded the harsh literal interpretation of the book, and proposed an allegorical exposition, all their arguments were rendered null, and the whole parallel between the doctrine of Cerinthus and that of the Apocalypse was destroyed.

Thus the *status questionis* was of such a nature, that there could be no controversy except with Nepotians and their hypotheses. Hence we may easily infer, who were the *τινὲς πρὸ ἡμῶν*, the predecessors to whom Dionysius appeals, and to what period they belonged.

The manner, too, in which they supported their position, is worthy of consideration. They did not say that they were informed by contemporaries of the apostles, that John did not compose the Apocalypse, that it was written by some one else ; or that they had trust-worthy accounts from well-informed men, according to which this book did not appear till after the time of John, and appeared in this or that place. No : these were not the arguments they employed ; but all that they adduced was drawn from the book itself. They went through it chapter by chapter, in order to show that it was without intelligibility or connexion, absolute nonsense enveloped in mysterious obscurity, etc.

That which they seem to have put forward as an ancient historical

<sup>1</sup> Ἰουδαϊκότερόν . . . . . τινα χιλιάδα ἐτῶν τροφῆς σωματικῆς ἐπὶ ξηρᾷ ταύτης ἔσσεσθαι ὑποτιθέμενος (Euseb. H. E. VII. 24).

statement, *εἰπὼν τινα, ὡς ἐκ τῆς παραδόσεως* (Euseb. III. 28), viz. that Cerinthus taught thus, is in fact not even compatible with his system. For, that God or Christ should restore the material creation of the Demiourgos and recall into existence the unsuccessful work of an imperfect Æon, is not to be supposed; especially as the work itself, unworthy of any nobler spirit, was assigned to the lowest of the heavenly natures. As little is it to be supposed, that the purest and most exalted spirit, Christ, who was incapable of earthly affections, sufferings, or joys, would commence a reign on this earth, establish his court here, and appoint dances and sensual diversions.

There is but one possible way of reconciling such a tenet with his opinions; and that is, according to a recent proposition, to suppose that Cerinthus had two doctrinal systems, one which he maintained while he lived and taught merely as a Jewish Christian, and a second which he formed upon becoming a Gnostic.<sup>1</sup>

In this case, also, Caius the Presbyter might be correct in saying: "Cerinthus, likewise, who in what he terms revelations presents us fables concerning wonderful visions shown him by angels, as if they were written by a great apostle, teaches, that after the resurrection Christ is to reign upon earth, and that under the new constitution mankind will give themselves up to enjoyment and diversions at Jerusalem, and, like an enemy of the Holy Scriptures, teaches, with a deceitful intention, that the space of a thousand years will be spent in marriage festivities."<sup>2</sup>

But, whatever be the fact, we must here drop this secondary inquiry, particularly as, in another connexion, we shall say something respecting the passage of Caius in that point of view in which it is of special interest.

It is sufficient that the predecessors of Dionysius were not able to bring the slightest historical evidence against the Apocalypse, their whole aim having been to render it suspicious on the score of its contents, in explaining which they made greater mistakes than their contemporaries, who were not themselves very happy in their exposition of them. And if, as they supposed, the choice as to the author lay only between John and Cerinthus, the choice they made is even ludicrous.

Dionysius himself did not make much account of their critical and exegetical acumen, but proposed a conjecture, on which he endeavored to confer probability from internal grounds. There lived at Ephesus, in the days of the apostles, a Presbyter named John, of whom Papias sometimes speaks in his writings; and this man Dionysius supposed to be the author.

But as his predecessors had not been able to establish their opinion in Africa, so neither could he establish his. Cyprian regarded the Apocalypse as a *divina scriptura, scriptura sancta*, in which God or Jesus Christ spoke to man.<sup>3</sup> As little could Lactantius and Augustine, and other fathers of the Latino-African church, be persuaded otherwise. The Egyptians themselves, as for instance Athanasius, the most cele-

<sup>1</sup> H. E. Gottl. Paulus, Comment. Theol. Hist. Cerinthi illustraturæ. Jenæ, 1795. Hist. Cerinth. Pars. prior, § 17 seq.

<sup>2</sup> Euseb. H. E. L. III. c. 28.

<sup>3</sup> Ep. LVI. Ad Thibarit. p. 218. Ep. LXIII. ad Cæcil. p. 256. De hab. virg. p. 216, 217. Ed. juxta Baluzium Veneta, 1758.

brated of the successors of Dionysius, and Marcus, the monk, insisted on John the apostle.

Such was the case in Africa. The Asiatics, however, showed more favor to the supposition of Dionysius, and nearly all the bishops of the fourth century seem to have been inclined to adopt it. Cyril of Jerusalem does not mention the Apocalypse in his catalogue of the canonical books, and does not cite it once throughout his works. Gregory Nazianzen, surnamed Theologus, admits its authority in doctrinal matters, and cites it; but in his metrical catalogue of the canonical books, in which he was obliged to present the general opinion, he does not mention it at all. Basil of Cappadocia and Epiphanius of Cyprus regarded it as a genuine production of the apostle John; but Amphilochius of Iconium candidly admits that some respected the Apocalypse as divine and others rejected it.

The opinion of the Asiatics is given us by Eusebius in his Canon, respecting which we have spoken in the proper place. He says that some assigned it to the first and some to the third class. Now in the latter he ranked such writings as were not indeed of apostolic origin, but were the *productions of pious men and orthodox teachers*. Among these, then, some numbered the Apocalypse. They ascribed it neither to the apostle nor to Cerinthus, but chose the middle path marked out by Dionysius.

But, besides the fathers of the fourth century, we are told of yet earlier opponents of the Apocalypse in Asia, viz. the sect of the Alogians, respecting whom the less men knew, the more they have written. Epiphanius enriched the natural history of the heretics with a new species, which he termed Alogians. Perhaps the Cyprian bishop took offence at the anti-apocalyptic sentiments of his neighbors and colleagues on the continent, and wished to vex them as much as possible.

However this may be, he invented an heretical denomination, under which he classed those who opposed either John's Gospel with its Logos, or his Apocalypse, or both together. There were, it is true, many such, who rejected one or the other, or both, viz. Cerinthus, the Nazarenes, the Ebionites, Cerdo, Marcion, and others. Shortly before, he even ranks among these Theodotus, who certainly did not merit the place, with reference to the Gospel, though he may with reference to the Apocalypse. But all these, as well as others, whom he might have added, bore other heretical designations, and their Alogian tenets were only a secondary matter, sometimes more and sometimes less intimately connected with their system.

On this account, all that he says is indefinite; for he made a leading characteristic of an accidental and unimportant trait, and on the strength of it united individuals of the most dissonant opinions. He might with equal reason have spoken of the heresy of the Antilukians, because many rejected the Gospel of Luke, or his Acts of the Apostles, or both. Of this heresy therefore, we find in Epiphanius neither a beginning nor an end, no occasion, original locality, leaders or branches. Wheresoever he speaks of it, it is in general terms, and as to its history he only tells us that there were Alogians formerly in Thyatira. These did not show due deference to the Apocalypse; he does not complain of them in respect to the Gospel. He gives no information as to their

origin, rise, connexion etc., but contents himself with merely stating the time when they disappeared in that city.

"When these," says he, "and the Cataphrygians had there set up their standard . . . they drew the whole city into their heresy : and those who deny the Apocalypse have themselves confirmed the warning (of the Apocalypse) in regard to those times. But now," he proceeds, "at the present moment, after the lapse of an hundred and twelve years, a church exists there ; it is increasing, and others have already arisen. But then the whole church was lost in the sect of the Cataphrygians."

He thus narrates the extinction of this heresy at Thyatira, one hundred and twelve years after which he wrote his heresiological work. It was written, however, under Valentinian the First, in the twelfth year of his reign, i. e. in 375 or 376 A. D. Now, if this heresy ceased an hundred and twelve years before, its extinction occurred in the year 263, near the time when Dionysius brought about the compromise between the Nepotians and Antiapokalyptians in Egypt.

One may certainly presume from this coincidence of events, that the Alogians of Thyatira had a connexion and mutual understanding with the Egyptians, who at this period yielded to an amicable accommodation.

If what Epiphanius says of this sect in the introduction to his work, viz. that they ascribed the Apocalypse to Cerinthus relates to the Asiatic Alogians (and he says nothing in regard to Africa), this agreement in an absurdity argues any thing rather than mutual independence.

The arguments, too, which they drew from the book itself, its obscurity, and impenetrable contents, τὰ ἐν τῇ ἀποκαλύψει βαθύς καὶ σκοτεινὸς εἶρημένα, are precisely those which were used for the same purpose by the Africans.

It is moreover clear, from all the counter-arguments of Epiphanius and all their own arguments which he notices, that the dispute was not based upon historical evidence, but upon the different views which each party entertained in regard to the book ; and that their reasonings ought to weigh against the testimony of the ancients only on the supposition that they are perfectly correct and irrefragable.

Such was the fortune of the Apocalypse in these two quarters of the globe. Let us now turn our eyes to Europe, to observe its reception and success there. Very few of the European Greeks in the early ages did much for Christianity, or gained an honorable remembrance for themselves, by their works ; and the writings of these few, as e. g. those of the excellent Dionysius of Corinth, have not escaped the ravages of time. We therefore seek in vain for any information on this topic from them, and must turn to the western writers, from whom we will now glean what we can.

One of the oldest monuments of the Roman church is the Shepherd of Hermas, the first part of which is occupied with visions, the second with precepts of morality, and the third with similitudes. The plan of

<sup>1</sup> Epiph. Hær. LI. p. 198. Ed. Basil. There is another still more obscure designation of time in regard to the origin of the Montanists, "Ὁς ἦν χρόνος μετὰ τοῦ σωτῆρος ἀνάληψιν ἐπὶ ἐννεμήκοντα καὶ τριοῖν ἔτεσιν ὡς μελλούσης τῆς ἐκείσε ἐκκλησίας πλανᾶσθαι καὶ χωνεῖσθαι ἐν τῇ κατὰ Φρόγας αἰρέσει (l. c.) which will not aid us here at all, as it relates exclusively to the Montanists.





a different turn to the opinion of Christians in the west respecting the Epistle to the Hebrews; and on this account we cannot now dismiss him without a strict examination. We might otherwise lose a considerable portion of the history of the Apocalypse in the west, and the remainder would want proper connexion.

The charge against Caius is founded on a passage of Eusebius before quoted, in which, while discussing the opinions of Cerinthus, he says: "Caius writes thus of him: 'Cerinthus likewise, who, in what he terms revelations, presents us fables concerning wonderful visions shown by angels, pretending that they were written by a great apostle, teaches that after the resurrection Christ is to reign upon earth, and that under this new constitution mankind will give themselves up to enjoyment and diversions at Jerusalem, and, like an enemy of the Holy Scriptures, teaches with a deceitful purpose, that the space of a thousand years will be spent in marriage festivities.'"<sup>1</sup>

Cerinthus, then, invented revelations in the name of a great apostle. The language is so general that it may have reference to Peter's Apocalypse, or Paul's, or even one bearing John's name, and still not the one now in our possession. But, it will be said, the sequel points more definitely to John. It is indeed evident that this forged revelation bore some resemblance in its contents to John's; but the passage by no means proves the latter to have been really John's, the one which was ascribed to Cerinthus. It rather evinces the contrary. The reign of a thousand years in the midst of sensual delights, which he cunningly devised out of enmity to the Holy Scriptures, seems to intimate a composition which was intended as a kind of counterpart to our Apocalypse. For, if he maliciously invented a sensual reign of a thousand years out of opposition to the Sacred Scriptures, this opposition must have had reference to John's Gospel, which alone assigns to departed spirits a thousand years' reign with Christ (20: 4, 5).

I will here quote the words of a modern scholar, who has explained this fragment of Caius with his characteristic acuteness: "*Manifestius autem adhuc discerni videntur αἱ ἀποκαλύψεις illæ Cerinthianæ a canonicâ, dum Caius a Cerintho numerum mille annorum in festum aliquod nuptiale fraudis studio atque ex odio Sacrarum Scripturarum applicatum fuisse innuit. Quarumnam enim Dei Scripturarum odio, ut numerice mille annorum festum impostor fingeret, adduci potuerit, nisi ipsius Apocalypseos canonicæ? Alibi enim in S. Codice mille annos festos promitti non novimus. Mens igitur Caii alia non videtur esse posse, præter hanc: finxisse Cerinthum Judaismo plenum, proprias ἀποκαλύψεις; atque ut facilius falleret lecturos, ipsum etiam illum mille annorum numerum ex divinis libris, ipsi adeo, ut in pessimam par-*

<sup>1</sup> Ἀλλὰ καὶ Κήριθος, ὃ δὲ ἀποκαλύπτειν ὡς ὑπὸ ἀποστόλου μεγάλου γεγραμμένων, τετραλογίας ἡμῖν ὡς δι' ἀγγέλων αὐτῷ δεδειγμέναις ψευδόμενος, ἐπεισάγει λέγων· Μετὰ τὴν ἀνάστασιν ἐπὶ γαίῃ εἶναι τὸ βασιλεῖον τοῦ Χριστοῦ, καὶ πάλιν ἐπιθυμίαις καὶ ἡδοναῖς ἐν Ἱερουσαλὴμ τὴν σάρκα πολιτευομένην δουλεῖν. Καὶ ἐχθρὸς ὑπάρχων ταῖς γραφαῖς τοῦ Θεοῦ ἀριθμὸν χιλιονταετίας ἐν γάμῳ ἐορτῆς, θείων πλανῶν, λέγει γενέσθαι. Euseb. H. E. III. 28.

tem iis uti non vereretur, exosis mutuū sumpsisse, suūque plasma ea canonicæ apocalypseos similitudine adfecta exornasse."<sup>1</sup>

This is the more certain, as Eusebius, in speaking expressly of the peculiar opinion of Caius concerning the Canon, says not a word of his disputing the Apocalypse. Jerome, too, does not appear to have known that Caius had an unfavorable opinion of this book. Photius, who was in possession of all his writings, and presents some critical notices of them, states as the most remarkable circumstance in regard to them, that he did not acknowledge the Epistle to the Hebrews, without being aware of any similar conduct in relation to the Apocalypse.<sup>2</sup>

Besides, neither in Rome nor in the other Latin churches was the public opinion adverse to this book, as was the case respecting the Epistle to the Hebrews. The Confessors of the Roman presbytery made use of it some time after in a letter to Cyprian of Carthage, which has come down to us in the collection of Cyprian's letters.<sup>3</sup>

After them, Victorinus of Pannonia, Hilarius of Poitiers, Gennadius of Marseilles, Orosius of Spain (in his Apology against Pelagius), together with many others, ranked the Apocalypse among the divine books of the New Testament, and made the same use of it as of the rest.

Yet it would seem (it may be said), if we rightly apprehend Jerome, that the Latin church did not accord to this work the full authority of a canonical book. He says, in his annotations on the 149th Psalm: "The Apocalypse, which is read and received in the churches, is not numbered among the apocryphal books, but the *ecclesiastical*." *Neque enim inter apocryphas scripturas habetur, sed inter ecclesiasticas.*

In the strict sense of the term, an *ecclesiastica scriptura* is a book of only secondary rank. It is well known that a contemporary of Jerome divides the books of the Old and New Testament, together with those which make any pretensions to be such, into *canonici, ecclesiastici, et apocryphi*. Now, if Jerome affixed the same meaning as this writer to the expression, *liber ecclesiasticus*, we have here a very singular fact. The Latins, then, placed this book in the second class, among the disputed books. Thus it will have been assigned to each of the three classes; and, taking into account the opinion of the Alogians, to a fourth even, viz. writings forged by heretics. Strange fortune for this book!

But Jerome does not attach to this word the strict signification which it bears with his contemporary. For in his Epistle to Dardanus he says: "If the Latins do not receive the Epistle to the Hebrews among the canonical Scriptures, so, with equal freedom, the Greek churches do not receive John's Apocalypse. I, however, acknowledge both; for I do not follow the custom of the times, but the authority of older writers, who draw arguments from both *as being canonical and ecclesiasti-*

<sup>1</sup> G. Paulus, Comm. Theol. Hist. Cerinthi illustraturæ. Hist. Cerinthi, pars prior. § 30.

<sup>2</sup> Euseb. H. E. VI. 21. Hieronym. Catal. V. Caius.—Photius, Cod. 48. Hæschel. p. 16.

<sup>3</sup> Epistola inter Cyprianicas XXVI. Ed. Ven. p. 92.

*cal writings, and not merely as apocryphal books are sometimes used."*  
*Non ut interdum de apocryphis facere solent, sed quasi canonicis et ecclesiasticis.*

Here Jerome has so expressed himself, that we must believe he made no difference between canonical and ecclesiastical, and affixed no stronger signification to one than to the other.

Moreover, his contemporary to whom we have referred, Ruffinus the Presbyter, who affixed the strictest signification to the words canonical, ecclesiastical, and apocryphal, and divided the books of the New Testament accordingly, was not aware that the Apocalypse was excluded by western Christians from the number of writings of the first rank, and classed with those which were disputed. He cites it as one of the canonical books; nor does he do so from his own individual judgment; for he says previously when he commences speaking of the Canon: These are the writings of the Old and New Testament, which are esteemed such from the tradition of the fathers, which were inspired by the Holy Spirit and intrusted to the church, as we learn from the writings of the fathers. And at the conclusion of his catalogue he adds: These are the books which were incorporated into the Canon by the fathers, and have been designated by them as the proper sources of our faith.

These facts by no means afford evidence that the Latins were misled, by the disputes among the African and afterwards among the Asiatic Christians, to alter, in reference to the Apocalypse, the established Canon of the New Testament.

### § 185.

In the treatment of its subjects the Apocalypse often enters much into detail, and adorns them with many embellishments. There is a great deal in the detail which seems not to be essential, and yet tends to give definiteness to the representation of the subject. The subsidiary points are therefore frequently of consequence, and it is difficult to give an outline of the whole, because in so doing we must necessarily omit these incidental matters. Still we will attempt a general sketch.

John beheld upon the island of Patmos, in a trance, a form like that of a man, in the midst of seven candlesticks; yet, this form was superhuman, uncommonly glorious and divine. It commanded him to write seven epistles to the seven churches of Asia, of which the seven candlesticks tended by seven spirits were symbols. These Epistles commend the virtues and reprove the faults of the seven churches, admonish some to reformation and others to perseverance (—4:).

\* \* \* \* \*

This took place upon earth; but now the door of heaven opens, and a herald commands John to enter. Here he beholds God upon a throne, encircled with glory, and around him are four and twenty of his elect upon four and twenty seats. A book with seven seals is in his right hand, and no one throughout the universe is able to open it. But a Lamb, standing in the midst of the throne, opens the seven seals, amid the hymns and praises of the spiritual world (—6:).

At the opening of the first seal, he perceives a hero with the insignia



of victory. At that of the second, peace departs from the earth; at that of the third, famine appears; at that of the fourth, death and his retinue. At the opening of the fifth, the blood of the martyrs cries out for vengeance. The sixth is opened; the sun and the moon are darkened; the stars fall from heaven; fear and anguish become universal. Four angels restrain the tempests, till an angel who ascends from the east has sealed with the seal of the living God out of every tribe of Israel twelve thousand who are to be preserved. Around the throne of God stand a multitude of all nations in white robes, with palms in their hands; who have come out of great tribulation, and are now comforted and sing praises to God (—8:). The seventh seal is opened; all heaven is silent; and now appear seven angels with seven trumpets. The prayers of the saints are upon an altar before God; and their sweet savor ascends before him (—8: 7).

\* \* \* \* \*

The first of the seven angels sounds; fire, hail and blood fall upon the earth. At the sound of the second trumpet, a burning mountain is cast into the sea, and the third part of the water becomes blood. The third trumpet sounds, and a bright star falls upon the third part of the rivers and fountains of waters, and they become bitter. The fourth sounds; the third part of the sun, moon, and stars is darkened. An eagle flies through the midst of heaven, crying, Wo to the inhabitants of the earth! The fifth sounds; a star falls from heaven, and to it is given the key of the bottomless pit, which it opens, and all kinds of hurtful insects come forth. At the sound of the sixth trumpet, the four angels bound in the river Euphrates are loosed. The third part of mankind die in battle; but the survivors do not repent or turn from their idolatry (—10:).

An angel of colossal figure speaks with the voice of seven thunders, and gives John a book, which he commands him to swallow. He swallows it, and begins to prophesy. He then measures the temple, but leaves the outer court and the city to the Gentiles. Two martyrs, who are mentioned in terms of high eulogium, prophesy and die in *figurative Sodom: the tenth part of the city dies* (—11: 15). The seventh angel sounds. The four and twenty elders fall down before the throne of God, and sing triumphal songs (—12:).

\* \* \* \* \*

A woman appears in heaven, clothed with the sun, with the moon under her feet, and a crown of stars upon her head. Her hour of delivery approaches, and a dragon lies in wait for her child, who is to rule the nations with a rod of iron. Michael casts the dragon down to the earth, thereby causing a general rejoicing in heaven. Even here the dragon persecutes the woman in travail, who avoids him by fleeing into the wilderness, where she brings forth and nurses her child. The dragon then makes war with the remnant of the woman's seed (—13:).

Meanwhile, a monster rises from the sea with seven heads, ten horns, and ten crowns. He makes war with the saints; all nations worship him. Another comes forth from the earth with two horns, speaking like a dragon. He subjects mankind to the power of the first beast; makes an image of him, and commands the world to worship him. He

marks the worshippers of the beast with a peculiar mark. The number of the beast is six hundred and sixty-six.

The Lamb stands upon Mount Zion, and sets a mark upon his followers. New praises are sung before him (—14: 6).

Three angels appear in heaven. One bears the everlasting Gospel; another cries: Babylon is fallen; the third denounces punishment upon the worshippers of the beast. There appears above a cloud the form of a man with a sickle in his hand, and an angel also appears with a sickle; one reaps the harvest, the other the vintage (—15:).

\* \* \* \* \*

Seven angels with seven vials of wrath come forth from the tabernacle of God, which is filled with smoke. The first pours out his vial, and a grievous sore falls upon men. The second pours his out upon the sea, which becomes like clotted blood. The third upon the rivers and fountains of waters, and they become blood. The fourth pours his out upon the sun, and men are scorched by its heat; the fifth upon the seat of the beast, and it is enveloped in darkness. The sixth pours out his vial upon the Euphrates, and its sources are dried up. Finally, the seventh pours out his vial into the air, and a voice sounds from God's sanctuary in heaven, crying: It is done. Nature seems to be in confusion; all kinds of terrible phenomena occur, to complete the ruin (—17:).

One of the seven angels now comes to John, leads him into the wilderness, and shows him another woman, sitting upon a scarlet beast with seven heads and ten horns. She bears the name Babylon upon her forehead, is drunken with the blood of the saints, and entices the nations to fornication. The heads are seven hills, the horns are ten kings. The beast hasteneth to destruction (—18:).

Another angel comes down from heaven, and proclaims the fall of Babylon; he incites the nations to vengeance. A lament over Babylon is sung upon earth. Hallelujah is sung in heaven; for the marriage of the Lamb is at hand (—19: 11).

\* \* \* \* \*

The conqueror on the white horse appears again. His name is written on his thigh; he is called *king of kings*, and also *λόγος θεοῦ*. An angel, standing in the sun, calls the fowls of heaven to the battle-field, where corpses of princes and mighty men await them in great numbers; for their last efforts at resistance have been fruitless (—20:).

Meanwhile, an angel descends from heaven, having the key of the bottomless pit. He there binds the beast, and shuts up his prison for a thousand years, during which time the saints reign with Jesus. After this period, however, the beast comes forth to fight anew, and calls distant nations to his aid; but in vain. He is consigned to eternal torment by fire (—20: 11).

The Judge is seated upon his throne; the universe flees away; the book of life is unrolled; the graves give up their dead, and they are judged (—21:).

A new heaven and a new earth appear. A new Jerusalem descends to earth, like a bride adorned for her husband. Its towers, its walls, and its palaces, are ornamented with characters relating to Christianity. There is consolation, quiet, peace, perpetual light; and there God reigns forever (—22: 6).

Then follow a final address to John and John's farewell words to his readers.

### § 186.

Interpreters have been less fortunate in regard to the Apocalypse than in regard to any other book of the New Testament; a proof that soon after the downfall of the Jewish state, familiar acquaintance with the cast of thought and peculiar views of this nation was lost, and even Asiatics no longer understood Jewish diction and Palestinian imagery. We may imagine, then, what has been the case in later days. At one time Antichrist and the end of the world were seen in it; at another the history of the church represented in visions. Then it comprised the history of the world, of the Saracens, Huns, Turks, &c. Then the Pope had his turn, the corruption of the clergy, next the Romish church and the Reformation, and many other things not a whit better chosen.

Among modern writers, Bossuet trod a more judicious path.<sup>1</sup> The Apocalypse appeared to him to refer to the conquest of Rome and the dismemberment of the empire, events which occurred through the agency of Alaric, king of the Goths. The contents of the book extend to this period, he thinks, and show the judgments of God upon the idolatrous state which had so often oppressed Christianity. The latter is now avenged and triumphs over all persecution. Other preceding circumstances, which are included and treated at still greater length, are, the fortunes of Christianity under the Cæsars, their persecutions of it, particularly that of Diocletian, the momentary quiet which it enjoyed under Constantine, and then the oppressions of Julian, by which the divine chastisement was hastened.

Such, in Bossuet's opinion, are the contents of the Revelation; and he was afterwards followed by Calmet. Wetstein thought differently, and imagined that it related, in particular, to the destruction of Jerusalem, the fate of Judaism connected therewith, and the ascendancy of Christianity.<sup>2</sup> He was followed by Herder, who is very happy in some of his details.<sup>3</sup>

Long before, however, Hugo Grotius, a man of extremely nice discernment, had penetrated further into its purport than any of the writers who have been mentioned. In the introduction to the fourth chapter of his exposition of this book, he says: "Pertinent autem hæc visa ad res Judæorum usque ad finem capitis undecimi: inde ad res Romanorum usque ad finem capitis vicesimi: deinde ad statum florentissimum ecclesiæ Christianæ ad finem usque."

A still more thorough insight into the mysteries of this book was obtained by John Simon Herrensneider, Professor at Strasburg; and he has exhibited it in a small but comprehensive treatise.<sup>4</sup> He shows that

<sup>1</sup> L'Apocalypse avec une explication. 1689.

<sup>2</sup> Nov. Test. Prolog. in Apoc.

<sup>3</sup> *MAPANAΘA*, das Buch von der Zukunft des Herrn, des N. T. Siegel." Riga, 1779. 8vo.

<sup>4</sup> *Apocalypsis a Cap. IV—finem illustrandæ tentamen*. Argentorati, 1786. 4to. 26 pages.

the two cities Rome and Jerusalem, the fortunes of which constitute the greater portion of the Apocalypse, are only symbols of two religions, the downfall of which is predicted; and that the third, which appears at the close, the heavenly Jerusalem, denotes the reign of the blessed. Commencing at these starting points, a celebrated scholar has discussed the Apocalypse very thoroughly, and his work is at present the principal one on this subject.<sup>1</sup>

### § 187.

In this book three cities are mentioned, in reference to which all these terrible occurrences above and below, and all the commotions of terrestrial and celestial powers, take place. One of them is Sodom, called likewise Egypt; another is Babylon; and the third is a new Jerusalem coming down out of heaven.

The whole scene in regard to the seven angels with the seven trumpets (8:—12:), relates ostensibly to Sodom. But we speedily see that this long-destroyed city only furnishes a name by which to designate another. For in this Sodom our Lord was crucified, ὅπου ὁ κυριος ἡμῶν ἐσταυρώθη (11: 8). In this Sodom is the temple, the outer court of which is given up to the Gentiles. Indeed, it is the Holy City itself, πόλις ἁγία, of which foreign nations are to take possession (11: 1 seq.). When two martyrs have perished in it, its destruction is determined (—12: 1). Josephus, the Jew, likewise, compared Jerusalem at the same period to Sodom (*Bell. Jud.* V. 10).

After a long episode, in which a woman appears in the pangs of child-birth, persecuted by a dragon; and after the description of two other monsters, who vex this woman's kindred, (12: 13: 14:), the destruction of Babylon is decreed in heaven (14: 8).

The seven angels with the seven vials of wrath execute the decree (—16: 17, 19), although Babylon had been a waste place for centuries, and scarce any relics of its glory were discoverable. But this Babylon is built upon seven hills: ὅπου ὄρη εἰδὼν ἑπτὰ (17: 9—18). It was an *urbs septicollis*, a famous mark of distinction, which makes it easy for us to understand what city is really intended. But the other characteristic, that it has the *imperium orbis terrarum*, βασιλεία ἐπὶ τῶν βασιλείων τῆς γῆς affords us complete assurance (17: 18), that this Babylon on the Euphrates is Rome on the Tiber.<sup>2</sup>

Thus Jerusalem and Rome are the two cities whose destruction was here seen in the Spirit. These cities, however, do not stand merely as such in this poetical production; they are figures of other ideas. Rome, or Babylon, is contrasted by the author with the everlasting Gos-

<sup>1</sup> Commentarius in Apocalypsin Joannis. Scrips. Joh. Godofr. Eichhorn. 2 vols. 8vo. Götting. 1791.

<sup>2</sup> Rome has a mystic name in the Apocalypse; one reason of which may be, that the mistress of the world really had a secret name, which it was considered disastrous to have publicly divulged (Plin. H. N. III. 5. Solinus, I. Macrob. Saturn.) III. 5. Plutarch, Quæst. Rom. Qu. 61. Servius, ad Æn. II. 295. IV. 598. Georg. I. 498. See the learned treatise of Dr. Fr. Münter, Selandiæ Episcopus, De occulto urbis Romæ nomine adl oc. Apoc. XVII. 5. Hafniæ, 1811. According to him, Jerusalem also had a mystic name.



pel, εὐαγγέλιον αἰόνιου (14: 6, 7, 8). Thus contrasted with Christianity, it can hardly denote any thing else than heathenism, to represent which it was natural to select the metropolis of the heathen world. John, too, describes it in such language as is commonly used by the prophets concerning false gods and the worship of them. It is the *habitation of devils*, the seducer to *unfaithfulness towards the true God*, to *πορνεία*, and all the nations and kings of the earth drink of the *cup of her fornication* (18: 2, 3. 17: 1, 2, 5).

If the capital of the heathen world represents the pagan religion, we may easily infer what is represented by the Jewish capital. What but the Jewish religion? Heathenism and Judaism, the two dominant religions of the ancient world, were doomed to fall.

And what was to take their place? *A new Jerusalem*, the kingdom of the blessed after this life (21:—22: 6). Such is the representation of this new Jerusalem, it is true, and as such it is usually regarded. But, if other cities denote religions, so must this. If Rome and Jerusalem represent heathenism and Judaism, the new Zion can be no other than Christianity, which is to rule and bless mankind forever. This the unity of the whole demands, for there would be no unity, if the plot, so to speak, was composed of such dissimilar topics as heathenism, Judaism, and eternal blessedness.

Why, moreover, should this kingdom of the blessed forsake its ancient and happy abode in heaven and come down among men, unless it were an earthly institution (21: 23). It was only as a religion that it could descend to earth to supply the place of the two religions which were destroyed.

It is no objection to this opinion, that the graves are first opened and the dead restored to life. The resurrection of the dead which is here mentioned is only one of those strong, terrific images sometimes employed by the prophets to denote a total change of affairs, the revival of national prosperity and of the religious constitution of the Jews (Ezekiel 37: Isaiah 36: 19).

And as to the circumstance that a day of judgment is connected therewith, we know that this too, was made use of figuratively by the prophets, to denote the execution of punishment upon those who oppressed and ill-treated the people of God, or to express God's purpose of bringing about a new epoch of glory for his religion and his people (Joel 3: 2 seq. Zephaniah 3: 8 seq.).

This being admitted, the whole passage in relation to the seven seals is but the introduction to the three principal descriptions, the dissolution of Judaism, the abolition of heathenism, and the ascendancy of the doctrines of Jesus (5:—7: 2). For, in accordance with the representation of an ancient prophetic writer (Isaiah 29: 11), prophecy is a sealed book; and its mysteries can be unfolded only by the Lamb near the throne of God, who rules with Jehovah, in whose hand are all events. Terrible plagues, famine, pestilence, war, and a total overthrow of kingdoms are to come; but from these calamities the elect of the Lamb are exempted.

The letters which commence the book, and extend to chapter IVth, are dedications to those churches with which the writer was particularly connected in the labors of his office.

The episode which follows the judgment upon Jerusalem (12:—13:),

relative to the woman who is in the pangs of labor and is persecuted by the dragon (the image of idolatry employed of old by Daniel), represents Judaism bringing forth Christianity, as is clear from all the circumstances and particular traits of the description. The other monsters, who come up out of the earth and the sea, and are in the service of the dragon, denote, it is plain, the Roman power by land and sea, which sustained the dominion of Paganism (13. 1—14: 6).

In correspondence with this after the judgment upon Rome (17: 1. 18:), we find another woman upon a scarlet-colored beast. The former woman, after her new-born child is taken up to the throne of God, henceforth wanders in the desert and in pathless regions; a beautiful image of the wandering condition of the Jews; but the fate of the latter woman is not so lenient. Her destruction is shortly afterwards celebrated with songs of triumph and with jubilee. It is evident that the latter denotes idolatry, as the former denoted Judaism.

### § 188.

It is unnecessary to remark, that by no means all the particular traits and images in this large work are significant. Many are introduced only to enliven the representation, or taken from the prophets and sacred books for the purpose of ornament; and no one, who has any judgment in such matters, will deny that the work is extraordinarily rich and gorgeous for a production of western origin. The description of the punishments by hail, pestilence, rivers turned into blood, insects and vermin, are imitations of the description given in Genesis of the Egyptian plagues, and neither require nor admit a special historical interpretation. The darkening of the sun and moon, the falling of stars, are poetical figures of common use in the prophets to denote, by means of great and terrible occurrences, vast national calamity, or the downfall of illustrious personages. The most sublime and most effective images and passages in the prophets are scattered by the writer with profusion throughout his work, for the purpose of giving it an oriental gorgeousness, which leaves all the productions of Arabian authors in the shade.

Moreover, the numbers are rarely to be taken arithmetically, unless when there are special reasons for so doing. Seven seals, seven angels, seven trumpets, seven vials of wrath, seven thunders—who does not see that the number seven is a prophetic and sacred number, and is used merely for the purpose of decoration and costume? So, too, with the round numbers, and the times and half times. They neither admit of a chronological nor a numerical signification; but are mostly indefinite numbers and periods.

Throughout the whole book there are but two events related, which are susceptible of a historical interpretation. In this statement we pass by the supremacy of Christianity with which the writer's visions terminate. The destruction of Jerusalem was an actual occurrence, and therefore we might expect the poet to present, as far as practicable, real circumstances, instead of poetical and invented ones. We are thus referred to history in our interpretation, so far as she will come to our aid unforced and of her own accord.

Parallel to this is the destruction of Rome. It is true that it had not

then occurred, but it is assumed by the writer as having happened, that his representations may correspond to each other. Still, however, he saw the then mistress of the world in a condition, which was peculiar to his time, and afforded him facts enough to portray a state visibly declining to the final ruin of its greatness. Here, also, in order to give fidelity, to his picture and render it easy of recognition, it was necessary to select facts from the actual condition of things. In this way his description became strikingly exact, and passed from the bounds of ideal imagery within those of real resemblance. In this, however, as in the former case, we must avoid everything trifling, far-fetched, or forced, in our interpretation.

### § 189.

Clear as it is, from what has been said, that the plan of this work is well-digested and its structure skilful, we cannot, after all, obtain a competent idea of it, without going over it step by step for ourselves and scrutinizing the mutual relation of the parts. In this way only can we come to perceive with pleasure the beautiful symmetry of its plan and its extremely nice construction.

It has been recently attempted to class it, as respects its structure, among dramatic works. We may, it is true, adduce the fact that there are in Clement and Eusebius (*Παρασχ. Εὐαγγ.*) fragments of a Jewish tragedian, named Ezekiel, who lived about this time. And, we may remark, that John wrote primarily for Ionian and Asiatic cities, which had been acquainted with and attached to the drama for centuries. All this, however, could only serve to explain the fact, if John had really selected a dramatic form for his production. But a mere *narrative* can never belong to the dramatic class of compositions; and, if it were necessary or possible to bring the poetical productions of every country and people under Aristotle's classification, or to arrange them after the Greek manner, this composition, which is merely descriptive, should rather be considered as epic. Yet, although it wants the principal characteristics of the drama, it cannot be denied that this hypothesis, in conformity with which the author of it has analyzed the whole book, is extremely useful as an aid to a conception of the book and to the memory.<sup>1</sup>

As to the language, it is less the language of John himself than that of the prophets, from whom he has borrowed their ornaments, to exhibit them here, as it were in a collection. And even when he speaks himself, he necessarily strives to imitate their style and diction, as nearly as possible, in order to preserve a uniformity of tone. Those, therefore, may be right, who assert that the style of the Apocalypse is not that of John; but they must not, on this account, deny his title to a book which he intentionally composed of the figures of other writers, and plentifully filled with the beauties of the literature of his country, after the oriental custom. Nor must they attempt to show a discrepancy in style, from a comparison of the Apocalypse with the Gospel or the Epistles; for the simple historical style, or the language of friendly communication, is not by any means the *terminus comparationis* for a decision respecting the authorship of a poetical work.

<sup>1</sup> Eichhorn, Comment. in Apocalyps. p. 19—33.

## § 190.

The book itself affords us a clue, which we will not neglect, in respect to the time when it was composed. In the seventeenth chapter, John describes a woman sitting on a scarlet-colored beast, which has *seven heads and ten horns*. This bold allegorical representation is intended to exhibit figuratively the condition of Rome. We may therefore expect to find in it traces of fact which individualize the subject, and enable us to recognize it as something more than an ideal fancy.

The woman, he says, is *ἡ πόλις ἡ μεγάλη*, *the great city* (v. 18), and bears the name Babylon (v. 5). The seven heads are *the seven hills* on which the woman sits (v. 9). The seven hills are also *seven kings*: καὶ βασιλεῖς ἑπτὰ εἰσι. Some verses after, the *ten horns* of the beast are explained as meaning *ten kings*: τὰ δέκα κέρατα δέκα βασιλεῖς εἰσι (v. 12).

It is not possible that Rome should then have had *ten* and yet at the same time but *seven* rulers. We must therefore consider the *kings* in one of the passages as not meaning persons, and must interpret them in a different manner. We will do this with reference to the seven hills, for the *ten horns* are so described that we find no difficulty in recognizing in them the Cæsars. *The seven hills are seven kings*, would then mean only that they were *kingly hills*, on which rested the dominion of the world. The play upon the numbers—five are fallen—one is—the other is not yet come—and the eighth hill is the beast, that hasteth to perdition—all this only signifies that the Roman power had not yet reached its utmost height, and yet the internal strength of the state was diminishing; it was evidently approaching its ruin.

After speaking of Rome and the empire, he passes to those on whom devolved the direction of its affairs and resources, and the domestic exercise of power. The ten horns are ten kings, δέκα βασιλεῖς εἰσι (17: 12). Let us see how they are described: they did not receive their power, but assumed it themselves; they themselves hate the woman, the πόρνη μεγάλη; they make her desolate and naked; they eat her flesh and burn her with fire. And this woman is the great city, ἡ πόλις ἡ μεγάλη (17: 16, 18). Can we fail to recognise in this picture the reign of the Cæsars, the manner in which they acquired the throne, their abuse of power, the execution and banishment of the most distinguished citizens, the squandering of treasure and resources, and, lastly, the incendiary act of Nero?

There had been, then, ten Cæsars at the time when he wrote; Augustus, Tiberius, Caius, Claudius, Nero, Otho, Galba, Vitellius, Vespasian, Titus. It was in the reign of this last, it would seem, that he wrote his work. Thus much from the writer himself; another historical account is given us by Irenæus, which deserves attention. In the Latin it runs thus: "Quoniam si oporteret manifeste præsentī tempore præconiari nomen ejus (animalis) per ipsum utique editum fuisset, qui et Apocalypsin viderat, neque enim ante multum temporis visum est, sed pene sub nostro seculo ad finem Domitiani imperii." (L. V. Adv. Hær. c. 30). An excellent scholar,<sup>1</sup> on the authority of this ancient version,

<sup>1</sup> Knittel, "Beytrage zur Kritik der Offenbarung, ein Synodalschreiben. Braunschweig. 1773.



has interpreted this passage as relating to the name of the beast—*nomen visum est*, and thinks that Irenæus understood by it *Titus Domitianus*, because, directly, before he proposes the name *Τέϊταν* as containing the beast's number stated by John, viz. six hundred and sixty-six. But, if we consult the Greek text, which has fortunately been preserved here, we shall find that we can translate either, *visus est*, *visa est*, or *visum est*: *Εἰ γὰρ ἔδει ἀνάφανδον τῷ νῦν καιρῷ κηρύττεσθαι τοῦ νομα αὐτοῦ, δι' ἐκείνου ἂν ἐρρήθη τοῦ τὴν ἀποκάλυψιν ἐωρακότος. Οὐδὲ γὰρ πρὸ πολλοῦ ἐωράθη, ἀλλὰ σχεδὸν ἐπὶ τῆς ἡμετέρας γενεᾶς, πρὸς τῷ τελείῳ Δομιτιάνου ἀρχῇς.* Thus *ἐωράθη* may mean *visum est nomen*, *visus est Joannes*, or *visa est Apocalypsis*.

The first of these interpretations, however, *visum est nomen*, would seem to be the most improbable. In Irenæus, the following statements precede the above passage: *Τέϊταν* is probably the name of the beast, for it is a royal name, "*tale autem est antiquum et fide dignum et regale magis autem et tyrannicum nomen.*" 2d. No king had yet borne this name, "*neque eorum regum, qui secundum nos sunt, aliquis vocatus est Titan.*" 3d. The name, nevertheless, might be borne by a future king, "*tamen habet verisimilitudinem, ut ex multis colligamus, ne forte Titan vocetur, qui veniet.*" From these words of Irenæus, it appears that the name had not yet occurred, and therefore it cannot have been Domitian.

As little foundation is there for Weistein's interpretation: *visus est Joannes*. On this supposition, the father intended to say: It is not very long since John was seen among us; he was alive in the reign of Domitian. He intended, therefore, to express the shortness of the period between his own time and the latter days of John. But what he said was ill-adapted to this purpose; for, according to his statement, John lived much longer and approached much nearer to his day, having lived till the time of Trajan: "*Sed et quæ est Ephesi ecclesia a Paulo quidem fundata, Joanne autem permanente usque ad tempora Trajani, testis est verus apostolorum traditionis*" (L. III. Adv. Hær. c. 3. n. 4). He would therefore have said: *neque enim ante multum temporis visus est, sed sub nostro sæculo, Trajani nimirum imperio.*"

There is no choice left but *visa est Apocalypsis*; and then, according to this father, the revelation was made to John in the reign of Domitian: "*si enim oporteret præconiarì nomen ejus, per ipsum utique editum fuisset, qui et apocalypsin viderat; neque enim ante multum temporis visa est, sed pene sub nostro sæculo, ad finem Domitiani imperii.*"

But the inference derived from the book itself does not agree with the statement of Irenæus. John reckoned ten Cæsars when he wrote his book, and the tenth was Titus; while Irenæus states it to have been in the reign of Domitian, the brother and successor of Titus, that the revelation was made. There are arguments in favor of the opinion of the latter, which appear in fact, to contravene the author of the book, himself.

John says that he saw the revelation at Patmos, whither he went for the testimony of Jesus Christ (1: 9). But ancient history unanimously asserts that he was not banished thither till Domitian's reign. The humane government of Titus, as well as that of his father likewise, was by no means stained with the persecution of any one *διὰ τὴν μαρτυρίαν Ἰησοῦ*; but his brother, who was of so dissimilar a character, is expressly charged with cruelty towards the Christians. The statements

and intimations of history, of which many might be presented here, are therefore in favor of Irenæus. How can this be explained?

John reckons ten Cæsars. Let us suppose that he reckoned only those that had deceased, without including the one then living. The latter persecuted Christianity, and had removed John himself from his station in the church, and banished him from the midst of his flock. What should he, what could he, say of him that was good? And would it have been in accordance with his Master's spirit, or the spirit of his doctrines, to speak evil of him? If then he could say neither good nor ill of him, had he any other choice than to be silent? Thus, it seems to me, both may be reconciled with each other. John enumerates only those emperors who had already deceased, and leaves it for others to mention him who was then living, and who was by no means an honor to the human race. Irenæus mentions the eleventh, concerning whom he had no reason to be silent.

### § 191.

John, then, wrote the Revelation in Domitian's reign; and this fact promises us some light in regard to the occasion and purpose of the book. He himself had been banished to Patmos for the testimony of Jesus (1: 9); and his was not a solitary case of hardship, but it was a part of the general tribulation of Christianity; he was but a *συγκοινωνός ἐν τῇ θλίψει*. The churches under his care groaned under severe suffering; Christians were exposed to punishments inflicted on them by the civil authorities and tribunals of justice. They were thrown into prison, and led to death, or were in constant expectation of it (2: 10, 11). At all events, there were not wanting distinguished examples of a noble constancy which had already been rewarded with the crown of martyrdom (2: 13). Some, however, had succumbed under their trials, dishonored their religion, and denied him who acknowledges his faithful followers before his Father and his angels (3: 4, 5, 6).

This happened in Proconsular Asia, under Roman judges. Such was the violence practised by paganism towards the adherents of Jesus. The Jews, it would seem however, (2: 9), had no small share in this violence, and were active, probably by informations, secret or open accusations, and by instigation, in adding severity to the lot of the Christians. We are told by Justin Martyr: They, as well as the Romans, treat us as enemies, consider us as rebels, murder and abuse us so far as they have opportunity.<sup>1</sup>

Such was the condition of Christianity between the adherents of the two religions. She was hated by both parties; and unhappily, moreover, her internal peace was disturbed by heretics, and her teachers were in exile.

Her condition was fearful; consolation and encouragement were needed, and whence should they come? Grounds of consolation were presented by the circumstances of the time. Jerusalem was in ruins; the ashes which covered the temple and the sanctuary had hardly gone

<sup>1</sup> Apol. Major. Rob. Steph. 146. Ἄλλ' ἐχθροὺς ἡμᾶς καὶ πολεμίους ἡγοῦνται, ὁμοίως ὑμῖν ἀναιροῦντες καὶ κολάζοντες ὑμᾶς, ὅποταν δύνωνται.

out. To this fact John directed the attention of the oppressed, and inspired them with hope. Justice had already been inflicted on Jerusalem; the last throes of Judaism were seen; soon this religion and the rage of its adherents would no longer excite apprehension!

The fact was striking; the example of the divine dealings towards the enemies of his word was a plain one, and might serve as a warning to heathenism. The latter days of Nero, the civil wars after his time, and the odious reign of Domitian, afforded, besides, no brilliant prospect as to the duration of the Roman power, with which must sink the authority of the state-religion. It would, therefore, lose the power of destroying any other system of religion.

Thus could he encourage Christianity, incite its professors to constancy in these trying times, that they might maintain their religion, and transmit it to those brighter days when it would rise nobly and triumphantly over every adverse fortune, erect its altars in every nation, and become the religion of the world.





# NOTES

## TO HUG'S INTRODUCTION,

BY

M. STUART,

PROF. SAC. LIT. IN THE THEOL. SEM. ANDOVER.

---

THE preceding work of Hug occupies so large a space, that it is impossible to make any copious additions to it without rendering the volume inconvenient and unwieldy. The writer of the following notes is constrained, therefore, merely to add a few remarks and notes, by which he hopes to render this volume more useful to students of New Testament literature in our country. The notes, from the nature of the case, must be very miscellaneous. They must also be mere *hints*, rather than formal discussion; for such discussion on all the topics where it might be easy to find occasion for it, would occupy, or might easily be made to occupy, at least as much space as the author's text itself. The reader will not therefore expect from me what the circumstances of the present case render inexpedient or impracticable.

It would have been more convenient, perhaps, for the reader, if references to the Notes could have been made in the *text*, as now printed, so often as these notes occur. But as it was anticipated that the number and quantity of them must be proportioned to the room occupied by the text, this could not be done while the latter was printing. The reader may now, by turning to the Notes, always be able, without any serious inconvenience, to find *where* and *when* they should be consulted, if he is desirous to consult them.

---

### NOTE 1. *Style of the New Testament Greek.* (p. 13.)

The statement made by Hug respecting the judgment which a critic "possessing ability to read them" would form of the New Testament books, viz. that "the Greek is certainly not in any one of the proper dialects of the language, but is a *corrupted* style of expression and

construction," is one which needs some correction. It savours altogether of the opinion that was formed and defended by many critics, before the labours of Planck and Winer in relation to this subject were laid before the world. Peculiar constructions, forms of phraseology, meanings of many prepositions, adverbs, and other words, were, by some critics of name, referred habitually and almost every where to the *Hebrew*. Later investigations, and particularly those by the two authors just named, have shewn that a great portion of the so-called Hebraisms are to be met with in the later Greek writers, contemporary, or nearly so, with the writers of the New Testament. The later *Atticizing* Greek is now regarded, by critics in general, so far as I know, as unquestionably the *basis* of the New Testament idiom. Departures from classic usage in some respects, are beyond all doubt to be found in the New Testament. But how could this possibly be otherwise? The writers of this volume were obliged to express a multitude of ideas, which were, as we may say, entire strangers to the heathen circle of thought and expression; ideas, which their living under the ancient revelation and their being enlightened by it, had made current and common among the Hebrews, but of which the heathen Greeks had entertained no conception, and therefore had formed no words to express them in an adequate manner. In such a case, all that was possible for the New Testament writers was, either to coin *new* words in Greek, or else employ words already coined in a new sense. They have accomplished their task in both these ways; as any good New Testament lexicon will every where and plainly shew. But in so doing, they have not acted differently from what a heathen Greek would have done, had he been transferred to a new circle of ideas, and undertaken to communicate them in the Greek language.

The supposition of mere *arbitrary* usage, as to style and diction, by the writers of the New Testament, is quite an unfounded one; and if true, it would set afloat every thing on which the sound rules of exegesis are built. The *syntax* of the New Testament in scarcely a single case departs from that which may be found in classic Greek; the *forms of words* employed by the sacred writers are throughout conformed to the method of the Greek idiom. Even when the New Testament writers coin new words, as they are occasionally obliged to do, they coin them strictly according to the laws of analogy. The infinitive mode, the participle, the article, are all employed *more Græcorum*. Prepositions and adverbs are employed in the usual relations, and with the usual senses, merely excepting, perhaps, some enlargement of meaning which is occasionally perceptible. In short, whether we resort to the *formal* or *syntactical* part of grammar, we see that New Testament usage has little in reality that may not be found in the heathen writers, a century before and after the birth of the Saviour.

So much indeed is and must be true, viz., that, being Hebrews, when writing Greek they employ Hebrew modes of thought and expression; and they do this often; and so one would naturally expect. But how could a Hebrew express his religious views and feelings without doing thus? That was, from the very nature of the case, quite impossible. Hence a knowledge of the Old Testament Scriptures becomes indispensable to an enlarged and accurate knowledge of the New Tes-

tament. *Hebraism as to shade or mode of thought*, may be often and almost every where resorted to with profit by the interpreter; but let him look well to the matter when he rests any important deduction upon the meaning of Greek words as merely traced to Hebrew usage, in order to make out a sense for them which is foreign to their ordinary nature. Great caution and judgment are needed here. It is only when the thought or the phraseology is manifestly of Hebraistic origin, that we can fully confide in making out the sense of the New Testament writers merely by resort to the idiom of the Hebrews.

Yet, with all these highly important limitations to the position advanced by Hug, the main thing which he aims at is true; i. e. it is true that none but Hebrews could have composed such a book as the New Testament. I think it is scarcely possible to go from an extensive and careful perusal of heathen Greek, to the study of the New Testament in its original language, without feeling an unwavering conviction spring up in the mind, that none but Hebrews could have written it. Yet this conclusion could not be properly built on the *formal* or *syntactical* phenomena of the New Testament style. It would establish itself on the shade of thought, the modes of expression, the familiarity with Hebrew ideas and diction, and the general costume of the whole. The conviction becomes spontaneous and irresistible, after a little practice in careful reading, that those familiar with Hebrew ideas, a Hebrew circle of thought, Hebrew modes of education, a Hebrew country and government, the Hebrew Scriptures, and (in a word) the whole condition of Hebrew life and action,—that none but such men, could possibly have written the New Testament.

This then would all serve to shew, beyond any rational doubt, that the New Testament was, as it professes to be, written by Hebrews, and so that it is evinced to be a *genuine* production, as far as this matter is concerned.

Inquirers of the present time can hardly refrain from astonishment, that Pfochen and many other *Purists* labored so long, so heartily, and with so much effort and learning, to shew that the style of the New Testament is purely Attic. They deemed this essential to its elevated character as a composition. But how is it possible that the style should be *purely Attic*, when the thoughts are so *Un-Attic*? What did the Attics know respecting many views of God and our duty, which are designated by the New Testament writers? Nothing at all. And in the expression of what lay beyond the circle of thought among the heathen Greeks, how could the *Hebrew* writers employ only pure Attic diction.

Besides; had Pfochen and others proved the point which they laboured to prove, the argument, now drawn as above from the actual state of the New Testament style, for its genuineness would have been undone. What critic, acting simply as a critic, would ever be brought to credit it, that Hebrew men had written in a style purely Attic? As matters now are, all is well. The style is entirely congruous with the condition of the alleged writers. What a pity, one almost involuntarily is led to exclaim, that so much time should have been wasted by the *Purists*, in order to prove what would have undone such an argument for the genuineness of the New Testament!

NOTE 2. *Circumstantial and internal evidence in the New Testament of its genuineness.* (p. 28.)

The detail of this in pp. 13—28 is worthy of the most attentive consideration of the candid reader. It can hardly fail to strike him in a manner adapted to excite a deep interest in the subject. The Works of Paley, viz. his *Horæ Paulinæ* and his *Evidences of Christianity*, give the sum of this kind of evidence in a most persuasive and attractive form, and are worthy of diligent and attentive perusal. In Lardner, also (as quoted on p. 28), he will find very much to the same purpose, which is candidly and ingeniously propounded. Indeed, I consider the internal evidences of genuineness in the New Testament, as being, to say the least, quite as strong as those of the Iliad, or Aeneid, or of the works of Cicero, or those of Horace. In some respects they are even more so; for the reason that there are so many peculiarities in the Hebrew state, circle of thought, action, and expression, that imitation of these books by foreigners would have been unspeakably difficult, or rather, quite impossible.

The works of Paley on the *Evidences of Christianity* (which need not be here described), will perhaps prevent the republication among us of the works of Schmid and Less, which are mentioned at the bottom of p. 28. Yet I could wish, for many reasons, that the work of Schmid, in particular, might be translated by some adequate hand, and republished in our language. The author, Christian F. Schmid, was a Professor of Theology at Wittenberg, during the later part of the last century, and his octavo volume (pp. 640) has relation to the *Old Testament* as well as the New; and therefore it covers ground in respect to which our present English literature is very defective. The main argument is contained in a Text, which comprises much less matter, however, than the Notes. The latter embrace illustrations and confirmations of the text, and quotations in the *original* of all the passages selected from ancient writers, as proofs of the positions advanced. As a *compend* of these testimonies, made up of innumerable documents brought together in this way, and of a running text which shews the drift and force of the argument and also of these documents, this book would be exceedingly valuable to students, who wish to see with their own eyes. A few of Lardner's selections, which Schmid deemed irrelevant, are omitted; and some testimonies that are omitted by Lardner, are added. Such a *Thesaurus* of this subject, translated and modified by judicious notes, would supply an important defect in our sacred literature; for very few can afford to purchase the works of Lardner *in extenso*, where the originals are also exhibited. Schmid is an example of *multum in parvo*. This work was published in 1775.

Of the two works (named in Note 1, p. 28) of Professor Less, of the University of Göttingen and a contemporary of J. D. Michaelis, the latter is the more complete, extensive, and satisfactory. It is in *three* volumes, and a part of it (a very valuable one too) was translated and printed in England in 1804, by Roger Kingdon A. M., of St. John's College, Cambridge, who had been a resident in Germany. Less himself had been for many years of his life, skeptical as to the genuineness



of the New Testament writings. He at length instituted a strict inquiry on this subject, and his book is the fruit of his inquiry. He is quite rigid as to the admission of testimony; and no candid inquirer, if he has been disposed to be skeptical, can well demur to any evidence which he does admit. He excludes very many passages cited as testimony by Lardner and Schmid; and with all his severe scrutiny comes out at last with a most distinct and complete conviction of the genuineness of the New Testament in general. The Apocalypse seems to him, however, a book of somewhat doubtful origin and authority; although he fully concedes its *antiquity*. The reason which seems to have most influenced his mind in making this conclusion, is, that the book is *unintelligible*. In what way, however, our inability to understand a book, can prove that a particular man did not write it, it would seem to be difficult to shew. In this respect, I think the worthy author has not displayed his usual tact and argumentative ability. Had the work of Eichhorn on the Apocalypse been published when he wrote, he would probably have come to a different conclusion; at least in respect to the supposed impenetrable obscurity of the book.

The work of Less as translated and published by Kingdon, and ably translated, too, might be republished in a moderate duodecimo or even 18mo. Is it not alarming to reflect, that some hundreds of thousands of worse than worthless books are published every year, and find purchasers and readers; while such a book as that of Less, conducted throughout on the rigid principles of scrutiny, and adapted therefore to attract argumentative and skeptical minds, should go into oblivion, so that the English and American public at large scarcely know of its existence?

The work of Jeremiah Jones, first published in 1726 in 3 vols. 8vo., and then republished at the Clarendon press at Oxford in 1798, on the *New and full Method of settling the canonical Authority of the New Testament*, etc., is a book replete with much interesting and useful matter. The main part of it is directed against spurious books, which in ancient times claimed a like place with writings of the New Testament, and to which Mr. Jones applies certain tests that are adapted to shew the weakness of those claims. The third volume treats of the authenticity of the Gospels and the Acts of the Apostles. The Epistles and the Apocalypse are not embraced in his plan. The reader will find in this work of Jones, a somewhat extended account of all the spurious books that we have any knowledge of, with many extracts from them. The originals of such as are still extant, he may find at length in the recent work of Thilo, comprising the remains of this kind of literature.

Mr. Jones was minister of a dissenting congregation at Avening, Gloucestershire, in England, and is said by Lempriere to have died at the age of 31; which is scarcely credible, considering the extent of his literary investigations, and the labour which they must have cost him. Of this work Hug seems to have been ignorant. The student will be well paid for consulting it, and for attentively studying the essential and argumentative parts of it. Like many other solid and excellent works of the last age, it has been nearly displaced by books of less valuable matter, but of more attractive form.

May some powerful and patient critic speedily arise, who, by an at-

tentive study of all these works, extensive reading and study of their original sources, logical and persuasive method of thought and argument, and orderly and scientific arrangement of matter and neat simplicity of style, will make a book which will proffer to the student all that is solid and valuable in all the works that are here named and many others, in relation to this important subject!

---

NOTE 3. *Manner of quotation by early Christian writers.* (p. 29.)

If the reader should give full credit to the account here given by Hug, of the manner of quotation by the most ancient Christian writers, he would surely be led into an error. Take as an example the oldest of all, viz. Clemens Romanus. His quotations are almost innumerable; yet he never names the book of either Testament, when he quotes. He occasionally names *prophets*, indeed, from whom he quotes. But then he calls their names as those of *persons*, and not as the titles of books, after the manner that we now practise. He often quotes with the formulas, *γράφεται, λέγει, εἶπεν ὁ θεός, κησὶν ὁ λόγος ὁ ἅγιος*, and the like; but nearly as often, particularly in respect to Old Testament books, he quotes without any formula at all. He quotes too with all imaginable degrees of freedom and departure in some respects from the diction of the original: evidently quoting often from mere recollection, which at times is quite indistinct, then at other times accurate. Sometimes he doubtless had the original before him; but the cases of this nature are scarcely capable of being determined, because exact recollection would produce the same effect upon the accuracy of the writer. In many cases he evidently paraphrases the original or metamorphoses it, accommodating it to his particular purpose, and designing scrupulously to retain only what he deems to be the substance of the sense.

As to the allegation of Hug, that the Old Testament is quoted by the early fathers with more accuracy than the New, I do not think there is any good ground for its support. I see no substantial difference, e. g. in Clement of Rome and Justin Martyr, in the modes or exactness of quotations, with the exception that formulas which naturally introduce quotations, are perhaps somewhat more frequent in regard to passages taken from the New Testament. Nothing is seemingly more apparent, than that they made their quotations usually from *memory*; the natural consequence is, that even in cases where the fact of actual quotation is very apparent, yet exactness of diction throughout is not to be found.

As to treating the historical books differently from what they have done the didactic ones, I know of no foundation for this, excepting that a long history in the Scriptures is of course summarily adverted to or given, while a proverb, or a maxim, or a precept, is often given at length because brevity permits it to be so given.

The allegation under No. III., that "the Prophets are cited with *direct reference* to them," has no other foundation, I apprehend, than what has already been suggested, viz. that the names of the prophets as *persons* are frequently mentioned, but not their names as the mere title of a

book. The allegation in No. IV. that 'the epistles are accurately cited,' has, as I apprehend, no other foundation than what belongs simply to the nature of the case. The *histories* in the Gospels are merely referred to usually, not cited at length; but the *didactic* parts of the Gospels will not be found to be quoted less accurately than the Epistles.

Nor does the representation of Hug seem to agree with itself. He tells us in No. III. that "the *didactic* writings of the Old Testament, are generally cited *verbatim*." Yet he says in No. V. that 'moral principles and tenets are quoted, so that the thought only is regarded, and not the words.' If any one should say, that the author means to affirm this merely of the New Testament, he is precluded from so saying by the affirmation under No. IV. that 'the Epistles of the New Testament are cited accurately.' The truth is, as I fully believe, that the intelligent reader who attentively watches the matter of quotation in the early Christian writers, will soon come to the entire conviction, that they usually quoted *memoriter*; that there is no material difference as to the manner of the quotations, whether it be Old Testament or New; that they often compress not only narrations but other passages; that they often conjoin different Scriptures in the same paragraph; that they sometimes accommodate the language of any and all Scriptures to the particular purpose they have in view, and thereby make departures from the diction of the original; and finally, that there is no one formula of quotation which is uniform, none which of itself distinguishes what particular weight the writer assigns to any quotation, none which is indispensable, inasmuch as the quotations are almost as often without any formula as with one.

As to the usual manner in ancient writers of quoting the words of the Saviour as his (No. VI.), nothing would be more natural than this. The authority of the Saviour is *supreme*. To cite words as his, is at once to assign to them their highest claims, their paramount authority.

All this, however, diminishes nothing from the weight and importance of Hug's argument in the sequel. In this, the *fact*, rather than the *manner* of quotation, is principally concerned. The *fact* is always to be judged of by general principles of quotation that were current in ancient times, and by the particular circumstances in each case, and the evidences of real resemblance to the original Scriptures.

---

NOTE 4. *Nature of the author's argument in favour of the genuineness of the New Testament books, in respect to quotations from them. (p. 31.)*

Hug does not enter at all upon the production of testimonies from writers in the church catholic. He expects the reader to consult Lardner for these, and also the other writers named on p. 28. (See Note 2 above). Taking it for granted that these testimonies are abundant and satisfactory, so far as any thing said by the friends of Christianity in its purer form is concerned, he proceeds in § 7 to produce evidence from the

remains of *heretical* writers in the second century, of the existence of the New Testament books in their present form at that period. These testimonies, although not wholly neglected by Lardner, Schmid, and others, are more critically and acutely treated of here by Hug, than by almost any other writer. It is scarcely possible that the young reader, who is a beginner in critical study, should feel in an adequate manner the importance of the testimony thus acquired. "Our enemies themselves being judges," is an appeal which has strong claims to enhance the *credibility* of a thing. If the opponents of the church catholic, and schismatics, still refer in their writings to the New Testament as a standard book, then we may well suppose it was generally so considered. And even in cases where they in fact *impugn* it, or any part of it, this also shews the actual existence of that which is impugned.

Such then is the nature and design of Hug's testimonies in this section, adduced from Celsus, Tatian, Cassian, Theodotus, and others, most of whose remains are to be found only in fragments, presented in the works of their opponents. When the nature of this case and the object in view by Hug are fully before the reader, he will, I trust, peruse with much interest, what he might otherwise, perhaps, consider as dry and uninteresting. The whole is drawn up with such studied brevity, and so little close regard to order and simplicity of arrangement, that it will require all the patience of the student, and tax all his powers of attention, in order fully to understand what the author has here written, and to profit by it.

NOTE 5. *Credibility of the New Testament writings.* (p. 64.)

Besides what Paley, Less, Lardner, and many others have written with so much ability in respect to this subject, the reader will find a very useful and brief summary in a recent book of Prof. Schott of Jena (1830), entitled *Isagoge historico-critica in Libros Nov. Test. Sacros*, §§ 128—133, with many notes comprising explanations and references to works of importance. The student should also by all means read the first volume of Rev. Thomas H. Horne's *Introduction*, where he will find an extended and very useful summary of the arguments employed in relation to this all important subject, and the literature which concerns it extensively noticed.

I cannot help thinking, with Hug, that on the supposition of unbelievers, viz. that the matter of the Gospels is not true, the character and doctrines of Jesus Christ are a greater miracle than any which they reject. Reinhard in his *Plan*, and Planck in his *Urchristenthum*, have urged this point with great power, and in my apprehension with unanswerable arguments.

NOTE 6. *Classification of Manuscripts.*

On this subject the reader should be apprised, that discussion is by no means at an end, and that after all the ingenuity, labour, and learning,



that have been exhibited, no real *terra firma* on which we can plant our feet, has yet been taken possession of or even fully discovered.

The theory of Hug is briefly this, viz. (1) That until about A.D. 250, there was a *κοινή ἔκδοσις*, i. e. editio vulgaris of the New Testament writings, corresponding in the main with the older Latin versions, with the Codex Cantabrigiensis, and with the old Syriac version or Peshito and the more ancient fathers.

(2) That about the middle of the third century, the defects of this *κοινή ἔκδοσις* becoming apparent to more critical readers, several undertook to revise and purify it. Hesychius engaged in this work, who was a bishop in Egypt; Lucian, a priest of Antioch in Syria, undertook a like task; and Origen in Palestine did the same. The revised text of the first edition, Hug supposes to have obtained currency in Egypt; that of the second, in Syria, Asia Minor, Thrace, and Constantinople or Byzantium; that of the third, in Palestine. He thinks that the old *κοινή ἔκδοσις*, as exhibited in the older Latin versions, still kept its place in the West; for certain it is, that Gelasius bishop of Rome († 496) prohibited the use of the Lucian and Hesychian recensions, on the ground that he supposed them to be corrupt; p. 117.

(3) A third period begins, according to Hug, soon after the respective recensions named above, and extends itself down to the present time; during which various alterations from a variety of causes have been made in all these different texts. In ancient times, different recensions were mixed together; and besides this, the *κοινή ἔκδοσις* would also come in for its share, with many possessors of Mss., in the correction and adjustment of them. From all these reasons combined, there is, in even the oldest Mss. now extant, more or less of mixture of the different recensions; although some Mss. have predominant characteristics, which are plain and very visibly marked.

There will be no question about the ingenuity, acuteness, and immense labour, exhibited in the briefly represented theory of Prof. Hug; at least I think there can be none among intelligent and practised readers. Its ingenuity, and indeed speciousness, has in part called forth high expressions of admiration from many critics, and made some converts. But although the *κοινή ἔκδοσις*, as stated by him, must be substantially true, as even Griesbach and others concede, yet that amid such an endless variety of readings as must have sprung up from causes suggested by him, during two centuries after the writings of the New Testament were composed, all Mss. should be capable of *classification*, so as to make the *κοινή ἔκδοσις* a distinct and separate *family*, easily distinguishable from all subsequent Mss.—who will venture to affirm this, and pledge himself to produce satisfactory proof? Origen says of the Greek Mss. in his time: “The difference has become really great, both from the carelessness of copyists, and from the arbitrary conduct of those to whom the correction of them is entrusted; as also from emendations, additions, and omissions made by many according to their own judgment.” (Cited by Hug, p. 87). How can it be, then, that there is but one character common to all these, and that this is so plainly marked that it will enable us distinctly to classify them, so as to separate them from the later families of Mss., if indeed there are such?

As to the second part of Hug's theory, viz. the *different recensions* by

Hesychius, Lucian, and Origen, it is denied in whole or in part, by some of the most able critics. Griesbach denies the existence of any recension of the New Testament by Origen, and thinks that what Hug names as such, is only a branch of the Lucian recension; Meletem, p. LVIII. seq. Matthaei, the celebrated editor of a critical edition of the New Testament, even denies *in toto* the existence of any such recensions as Hug has described, and adopts the Byzantine Mss. as his only safe guide. The class which consists of such as the Codex Bezae, the Codex Claromontanus, and others of the like nature, he names *editio scurrilis*; and he applies no softer epithets to those who pay deference to them. But although there is a degree of extravagance in his positions, yet it is in fact somewhat doubtful, whether the recensions of Hesychius and Lucian ever obtained any extensive circulation in the countries where they were made. Jerome (Praefat. in quatuor Evangg.) says, respecting these recensions: "Praetermitto eos codices, quos, a Luciano et Hesychio nuncupatos, *paucorum* hominum asserit perversa contentio, etc." The intimation in these words most clearly is, that the Hesychian and Lucian recensions were confined to a narrow circle of usage (*paucorum*); and disapprobation of this usage is plainly signified by *asserit perversa contentio*. If Jerome is in the right, it would seem that Hug has attributed a great deal too much influence over the general state of the New Testament Mss. after the middle of the third century, to the labours of Hesychius and Lucian.

Nor should it be unobserved by the critical reader, that the extensive and permanent circulation of the Lucian recension at Constantinople and in Thrace, which Hug and others have assumed, is a matter of great doubt, and, in view of some testimony that is extant, quite an improbability. Eusebius testifies (De Vita Const. Mag. I. 4. c. 36), that the emperor Constantine required of him to cause *fifty* copies of the New Testament to be transcribed, for the use of the churches at Constantinople. Now the reverence which Eusebius had for Origen is well known, and is every where most abundantly testified by him. That the copies would be made, therefore, from such Codices as were approved by Origen and used by him, there can scarcely be a doubt. But what were these? Origen's numerous works clearly shew that his Codices of the New Testament were of the *Alexandrine* hue; for he was educated, and spent the former part of his life, at Alexandria. Nor has Origen, in any of his works, apparently quoted a different text from that which seems to have been predominant at Alexandria. If all this be allowed, as I think it must be by those who are conversant with this subject, then it would seem to follow, that from the time of Constantine and Eusebius, the Mss. at Constantinople must have been of the Origenian, i. e. Alexandrian cast; and so, after all, the Byzantine Mss. are to be ultimately referred to those which Origen, and after him Eusebius, employed.

The passage in Jerome (ad Matth. 24: 36), on which Hug mainly relies to prove a distinct recension by Origen, is hardly capable of proving so much. Jerome says, that "in some Latin Codices, *neque filius* is here added to the text; but," he adds, "this is not contained in Graecis, et maxime *Adamantii et Pierii exemplaribus*. Schott, De Wette, and others, suppose it to be sufficient here to understand the *ex-*

*emplars of Adamantius (i.e. Origen) and Pierius*, as meaning those Mss. which these distinguished individuals sanctioned and employed, and to which they gave currency. And indeed, if the whole be compared with what Origen says (on Matthew in Vol. III. p. 671, ed. de la Rue), this would seem to be altogether a probable interpretation of his words. Origen takes occasion to speak of his critical edition of the Septuagint, and his emendation of it by means of asterisks and obelisks, and then he says, (the Latin translation of him only is here preserved): "In exemplaribus autem Novi Testamenti, hoc ipsum me posse facere sine periculo non putavi." If then his judgment was, as it here seems to be, that he could not without danger undertake to correct the Mss. of the New Testament; and if, as even Hug concedes, he did not undertake to do this until extreme old age and as his last work; is it probable that he would, at such a time, and against his own mature judgment, execute a work which is least of all adapted to the employment of a superannuated man? On the whole the probability cannot be well made out.

The *threefold recensions made by Griesbach* are well known, viz. the Alexandrine or Oriental, the Occidental, and the Byzantine. Hints in Bengel's *Introductio ad Crisin N. Test.* and in Semler's *Vorbereitung-en zur Hermeneutik*, seem to have first led him to this. The text of the occidental recension, as he supposes, may be found in the most ancient Latin versions, in Tertullian, Cyprian, Irenaeus, Ambrose, Augustine, etc.; also in the Mss. of the Gospels, D. 1, 13, 69, 118, 124, 131, 157; in the Mss. of the Epistles, D. E. F. G. Its character is *exegetical*; it contains glosses and periphrases, and *hebraizes* in a high degree.

The *Alexandrine* recension, he thinks, is found in Clemens Alex., Origen, Eusebius, Athanasius, Cyrill Alex., Isidorus Pelus., and others; in the Memphitico-Coptic, Philoxeno-Syrian, Ethiopic, and Armenian versions; and also in the Mss. of the Gospels, B. C. L. 33, 102, 106; and in those of the Epistles, A. B. C. 17, 46, 47. Its characteristics are, higher grammatical purity and correctness of diction.

The *Byzantine* or *Constantinopolitan* recension is found, as he avers, in the Greek fathers of Asia Minor and the neighboring provinces, from the fourth to the sixth century; in the Gothic and Slavic versions; in the Mss. of the Gospels, A. E. F. G. H. S.; and as to the Epistles, in the Mss. of Moscow.

To the *Peschito*, Chrysostom, and Mss. P. Q. T., he attributes a *mixed* text; and in a considerable degree to more than twenty Mss. more.

This formal and definite division was attacked with great vehemence by Matthaei, and substantially doubted and impugned by Eichhorn, and others. It has occasioned great debate among critics; especially so, as Griesbach estimates the *value* of a reading very much by the classes of recensions which support it, rather than by the number of witnesses.

Besides these opponents on the continent of Europe, Griesbach has had some powerful ones in England. Dr. Laurence (now archbishop of Cashel), attacked it with great vehemence and acuteness in his *Remarks*

on the *Classification of Mss. adopted by Griesbach*, Oxf. 1814. In 1815, the Rev. F. Nolan published his *Inquiry into the Integrity of the Greek Vulgate or Received Text of the New Testament*; in which he has laboured to overthrow several of Griesbach's positions, and not without success. He, however, comes out at last, with an Egyptian, a Palestine, and a Byzantine family or recension of Codices; which seem to differ in nothing very material, except as to some supposed metes and bounds, from the three recensions of Griesbach. Schott in his *Isagoge* declares also, that the effort of Griesbach to establish his classification, is a failure; and so Scholz, in his *Curæ Criticæ*, and in his *Proleg. ad edit. Nov. Testamenti*.

The division of Scholz himself, in the work last named, is into the *Alexandrine* and *Constantinopolitan* recension. To the former he assigns the copies in Egypt and in the West; also the Coptic, Latin, and Ethiopic versions, and the ecclesiastical writers of those regions. To the latter he assigns the copies of Palestine, Asia Minor, Syria, oriental Greece, specially Constantinople, the Philoxenian, Gothic, Georgian, and Slavic versions, and the ecclesiastical writers of those regions. To the latter he gives an almost unbounded preference.

But in amalgamating the Alexandrine and Western Mss. together, he has done not a little violence to both. Moreover, taking the fact as true, which Eusebius has related in respect to his making out *fifty* copies of the New Testament for the churches at Constantinople, in the time of Constantine; and the fact also that Eusebius is known, by the quotations in his works, to have given a preference to the Alexandrine copies; how can the superiority or even the discrepancy of the Constantinopolitan class of Mss. in respect to the Alexandrine, be so definitely made out?

Eichhorn, in his *Introduction to the New Testament*, divides Mss. into *Asiatic*, *African*, and *Mixed*. He has treated the subject with a degree of skill and moderation, which it would have been well if many other writers could have imitated.

The result of all is, as the reader may now well see, that no *terra firma* is yet won. So judges De Wette, who is no ordinary judge; so in substance Schott also, in his *Isagoge*. Of course the estimation of the value of readings, which proceeds from *classification* merely or principally, is not to be confided in; and consequently not a few of the decisions of Griesbach, who has gone far in criticisms of this kind, may be justly subjected to revisal, and some of them, doubtless, to reversal.

With such facts before him, the critical reader of the New Testament should look well to it how he trusts himself implicitly to the guidance of any one of the so-called *critical* editions. Much land yet remains to be possessed. The labour of collation is, as yet, very imperfectly performed; and that of quotations by the fathers from the Bible, as yet very imperfectly estimated or examined. The remarks of Hug, certainly a good practical scholar, as exhibited above, are a voucher for the correctness of this affirmation.



NOTE 7. *Materials of Mss., modes of writing, stichometry, punctuation, editions, etc.* (p. 148 seq.)

Few, if any, of the various Introductions to the New Testament will be found so instructive, well-grounded, and satisfactory as Hug is upon these several points. The reader who wishes for more upon them can easily consult Marsh's *Michaelis*, Eichhorn, Schott, Haenlein, Bertholdt, De Wette, Horne, etc. Particularly interesting, in Hug, is the account of stichometry, and the consequent gradual rise of the modern punctuation.

The account of the principal Mss. and editions of the New Testament (pp. 156—199) will be found as ample as is necessary for a student in general; and great pains have been taken by the author in respect to accuracy. This part of the book, after a general perusal, does not need to be *studied*, like some other parts, but to be reserved for special consultation, when the nature or importance of some prominent Ms. or critical edition of the New Testament becomes a question of special interest.

Hug has brought down his account of *critical* editions no lower than the second edition of Griesbach, Vol. I. 1796, Vol. II. 1806. Of this celebrated edition, Vol. I. has been reprinted with valuable additions and corrections, and with great care, by Prof. David Schulz, Berlin, 1827.

Dr. C. Knapp, of Halle, printed a critical text of the New Testament in 1797, in which he mainly followed the maxims of criticism laid down by Griesbach, and in general exhibited the same text as that published by Griesbach. Yet there are departures from it, in some important readings; and the editor every where has bestowed great pains on the examination of readings, on the punctuation of the text, on the accentuation, on the mode of dividing or paragraphing the text, and in the selection of important various readings for exhibition to the reader. This work has had a wide circulation in Germany, the fourth large edition being printed in 1830.

A rival work to this, furnished with a Latin translation, at first mostly a copy of Griesbach's text, but afterwards departing (in the *third* edition) in many places from it, was published by Schott, Professor of Theology at Jena, in 1805; again, in 1811; and a third time, in 1825.

A small stereotype edition was published in 1820 at Leipsic, edited by that masterly New Testament critic, the late J. A. H. Tittmann of the University at Leipsic. His judgment as to the text, is always worthy of consultation and deference.

In 1824, the late Prof. Vater of Halle published an edition of the Greek Testament, in which the text of Griesbach and Knapp is revised, various readings are given, with critical and exegetical annotations, and indexes of various kinds; in many respects a useful edition to young students, as there is very considerable critical and exegetical matter exhibited in it.

In 1821, Gratz (of the Roman Catholic Church), at Tübingen, published a new edition comprising the Complutensian Greek text, the Vulgate text of 1592, with readings from the third edition of Robert Stephens, and from the editions of Griesbach and Matthæi.

Very recently a new critical edition of the Greek text has been published at Berlin, 1831, by C. Lachmann. The object and plan of this are described by the editor, in the *Theol. Studien und Critiken*, 1830, pp. 817—845. It is in 12mo, without preface, stereotyped, with a fair impression and on good paper, and has been highly commended in some of the leading reviews of Germany. From the notice which the most recent interpreters of the New Testament in that country take of it, it would seem to be highly estimated and in great demand.

To a Syllabus of the various readings of the *Textus Receptus* where these differ from his own text, which the author suffixes at the close of the volume, he has prefixed a few editorial remarks, from which it would seem that his judgment about the value of readings differs in no small degree from that of Griesbach and his followers. "The editor," says he, "has no where followed his *own* judgment, but the *usage of the oriental churches*. So often as he has found this not to be uniform (*constantem*, consistent), he has, as far as possible, guided himself by the agreement of the Italian and African churches. Where he has found discrepancies between the sources which have become widely diffused, he has indicated this, partly by including the words in a parenthesis, partly by noting them in the margin." The diversities of the *Receptus* from his own text, are, as has been intimated above, noted at the end of the volume.

The reasons for such a course in forming his text, the editor has given at length in the Periodical mentioned in a preceding paragraph. It would seem, therefore, by the present demonstrations of public opinion as to the criticism of the New Testament text, that it is inclining, after all, toward the direction which Matthæi long ago endeavored to give it, and for which Scholz, in his new critical edition of the New Testament, strenuously contends, viz. toward a reception of the *oriental* Mss. as being of the highest and best authority.

The edition of Scholz, just mentioned, is yet unfinished. The first volume, in 4to, was published in 1830, and contains only the four Gospels with copious *Prolegomena*. In these the editor endeavors to establish the credit of the *Constantinopolitan* recension as greatly superior to the Egyptian and Occidental; which last two classes he amalgamates into one, under the name of *Alexandrine*. This work seems to have found but little favour in Germany, although the learning and diligence of the author are commended very liberally by such writers as De Wette and Schott. In England more interest has been taken in it; and efforts have been there made, in order to enable the editor to go forward with his second volume; which, it seems, has been likely to fail for want of patronage. Solidity, acuteness, and stability of mind and judgment, seem not to be leading and prominent characteristics of this critical editor.

Lachmann, on the other hand, has been encouraged by the success of his small critical edition of the New Testament, to engage in the arduous labour of a new and large critical edition, with full apparatus.

The reader who is unaccustomed to the studies of *lower* criticism, i. e. that which occupies itself with the establishment of a pure text, can hardly conceive of the difficulties that press upon this subject, and the labour necessary to surmount them. To no part of sacred litera-

ture have we more occasion to apply the striking declaration of Aulus Gellius, that *truth is the daughter of time*, than to that of criticism in respect to the text of the New Testament. After a century of strenuous efforts by minds of the first order, we are still in an oscillating position, as to many things relative to this subject, and as to not a few readings of the New Testament. Yet we should call to mind, and gratefully remember too, that these in general are not points which are essential either to Christian doctrine or practice. A *pure* text is indeed a desideratum of an important nature; but there may be several conjunctions, prepositions, or other words, less or more than in the present text, or even different from it, without much affecting our duty or our happiness. There is a time, in a course of sacred study, when almost every student feels a desire to plunge somewhat deeply into lower criticism, or the investigation of the state of the text; but by and by he comes to learn, that most of this belongs rather to the *manner* than the matter of the text; and he is then apt to become too indifferent about it. The subject is surely one of deep interest. Every candid man will commend all well-directed labours in respect to it; but the experienced critic will soon learn not to be *totus in illis*, nor to feel that it is more important to decide whether a *δέ* or a *γάρ* should stand or fall, than to inquire what rule of faith or practice the text contains.

NOTE 8. *Versions of the New Testament.* (p. 199 seq.)

The principal interest which these can possess, as to matters of criticism and interpretation, arises from two sources; viz. (1) They may have preserved the readings extant in the Greek Mss. from which they were made; some of which, of course, must have been very ancient, inasmuch as some of the versions are very early. (2) Some of the versions may afford exegetical help, in respect to passages which are obscure and difficult.

It is easy to illustrate and confirm these two propositions, in a few words. We will suppose that the *Peshito* or old Syriac version was made, (as seems most likely), in the latter half of the second century, or near the commencement of the third. The person who made it must have been skilled in the Greek of that day, and therefore in the Greek which is substantially the basis of the New Testament diction, and which was then spoken in Palestine and Western Asia in general. This being *then* a living language, idioms that are now obscure and difficult to us, may have been quite intelligible and easy to him. These he might often express in the Syriac, so as to make them very intelligible to a reader of the present day, who well understands this language. The text, moreover, which lay before him, he would generally, if he well understood it, express so as to shew us what the original diction probably then was. In such a case we should have, as we in fact do have in the *Peshito*, a witness for the ancient text, and a help to the sense, in one and the same version.

Of all the monuments of antiquity now extant, or at least of all yet



discovered, I regard the version of the Peshito as the most important in respect to the establishment or verification of the true Greek text. It precedes in age, by several centuries, any Greek Ms. that we now have; it was confessedly made with great skill and ability; the *Hebrew* colouring of the New Testament rendered it easy, for the most part, to be translated into the Syriac, which is an idiom so kindred; it has been exempt from all the criticisms and tamperings of the Alexandrine or any other western school of criticism; and from the recensions of Hesychius, Lucian, or Origen (if he made one); it has come down to us from the primitive ages in a channel entirely different from that in which the common Greek text has descended; it appears, from the comparison of Mss. so far as this has gone, to have suffered less than is common from the variations made by scribes; and it is therefore a witness above all exception, as to its general testimony, for the fidelity and accuracy with which the Greek text has in the main been preserved. No monument of antiquity possesses, therefore, more to excite critical interest, or even exegetical, than this. The student who is familiar with it, cannot well entertain a doubt of the early canonicity of the New Testament books in general, and of the importance which the Christian churches in the primitive ages attached to them.

The 2d Pet., the 2d and 3d of John, Jude, and the Apocalypse, are wanting in the original Peshito, and have been supplied, in modern editions of it, from another version. This circumstance serves to shew, that the version in question was made so early, that the New Testament Canon, as a *whole*, was not yet completed.

After all, however, too much stress should not be laid by the critic or interpreter on this or any other version; because in all versions the translator occasionally finding himself embarrassed for want of proper or adequate diction, and unable to give a literal version because of the nature of the idiom into which he is translating, will (not to say *must*) of course indulge more or less in *paraphrastical* expressions, which some times fail to convey the exact impression designed to be made by the original, and of course must fail in giving us the means of discovering its exact diction. On this subject, a Programm of Winer, entitled *de Versionibus N. Test. usu critico caute instituendo* (Erlang. 1823), deserves to be carefully studied. Worthy to be read, also, on the subject of the Syriac version, is Weber, *de usu Vers. Syr. hermeneutico*, Lips. 1778, 8vo. Also Gloucester Ridley, *de Syr. Vers. Indole et Usu*, Oxon. 1761; reprinted in Wetstenii *Libellus ad Crisin, etc., Nov. Test.*, Halle, 1766. Of the general nature and use of all the Syriac versions, the reader will find an account in Storr, *Observatt. super N. Test. Versionibus Syr.*, 1772; also in Adleri, *Versiones Syriacae*, 1791, and in all the Introductions to the New Testament.

While I have a full conviction of the high importance of this most excellent of all the ancient versions, and feel that the study of it gives a degree of conviction to an inquirer's mind, who is seeking for evidence of the genuineness and antiquity of our present New Testament text, which nothing else perhaps can give, I should still think it hazardous to undertake the *critical* emendation of the text in general, from this or any other version. Take the facts, for example, exhibited by Winer, viz., 'The Peshito always puts *ἡμῶν* (*our*) after the word *Lord*; instead of



αὐτός, αὐτοῦ, the proper name to which it refers is generally repeated; the particles εἰτα τότε, ἰδοῦ, superfluous participles such as λέγων, ἀποκριθεὶς, etc., are usually omitted; πᾶς is often arbitrarily put in or left out; and ὡς, ὁμοίως, etc., often omitted.' With such facts in view, how could we conform the Greek text throughout to this version, without abusing the rights of criticism.

The student may be entirely satisfied of the well founded nature of these cautions, by taking any of our best English translations of classic authors and comparing them with the original; e. g. that of Spelman compared with the Greek of Xenophon. While he has happily transferred to the English the spirit of the original, yet if a critic some centuries hence should undertake to decide, as to minute things, what the text of Xenophon was a half century ago, by this English version, he would surely find it to be a difficult task, or rather he would find it altogether impossible. And so with the Peshito, or any other ancient version. The general evidence derived from the text is most satisfactory and conclusive. But the minute and unimportant parts of diction have not always been preserved, because they have not always been regarded. A witness to the actual presence of a person in a particular place and at a particular time, may be altogether a true and credible witness, although he may not remember how many, or what, were some small appendages on that person's dress, or whether he fastened his shoes with buckles or a silken thong.

To conclude; the reader will find Hug's account of the Peshito to be, on the whole, the most critical and satisfactory of any which are contained in the Introductions to the New Testament, or indeed elsewhere. The recent Codices of the Peshito, brought by Dr. Buchanan from Hindostan to England, and compared by Prof. Lee for his admirable and beautiful edition of the Syriac New Testament, 1816, under the auspices of the Bible Society in England, will answer a very important purpose in the establishment of the text of this deeply interesting relic of antiquity. Whether the promised *Collationes* of these oriental Mss. have yet been given to the public, is to me unknown. The execution of such a work is important to criticism. It is earnestly to be hoped that it should not fail.

In regard to the second Syriac version, i. e. the Philoxenian as it is named, from Philoxenus or Xenaias bishop of Hierapolis, who caused it to be made by Polycarp, one of his *χωρεπίσκοποι*, it has for its basis the old Peshito, but is often discrepant from it, inasmuch as it is a literal, and one may say slavish, imitation of the Greek original; so much so, as often to violate the proprieties of the Syriac idiom. Still, this very circumstance renders it important as a witness to the state of the Greek text in the year 508, when it was composed.

No where will the reader find an account of the various ancient versions, more to his satisfaction in general, and to his instruction, than in the present work of Hug. This is a kind of literature in which he seems to take much pleasure, and which he has prosecuted to very good purpose. In particular, the important version called the *Vulgate*, is here described with a minuteness and an accuracy, which entitle the author to the thanks of every student of sacred literature. He may

here learn how much dependence is to be placed on a version, which, notwithstanding the ingenious suggestions of Hug (p. 279) respecting the meaning of the Council of Trent (in Sess IV. Decret. 2), and the *liberal exegesis* which he would fain give to their decree, and indeed must give in order to defend his own critical views, is after all made the *editio authentica* of the Roman catholic church, and thus placed above the original Greek and Hebrew Scriptures. With the decree in question before him, how could any Romanist, in a dispute of a theological nature, appeal *ultimately* to any thing but this *authenticated* arbiter, viz. the Vulgate, as determining what the original Scriptures must mean? Hug, indeed, fully sees the weakness and folly of a claim to decide this point, by any council; but his relation to the Romish church, does not permit him to speak of it in a direct manner. He has, however, striven to do away all the real force of the decree in question, by his interpretation at the bottom of p. 279. He avers, that the decree of the Council is "no prescription of *doctrine*," and that "it has reference to the *circumstances of the times* in which it was issued." So much to be sure, is true, that it is not literally in itself a rule of doctrine; but it prescribes the ultimate *authentic* appeal, in all cases of doctrinal controversy; and so far are the Romish church from confining the authority of the Vulgate to "the times" in which it was authoritatively adopted as the only standard, that down to the present hour it is read and circulated as their only *authentic* Bible. Versions in order to be popular, must be conformed to it.

By mistake Thomas of *Harkel*, p. 218 and elsewhere, is called Thomas of *Charkel*; which mode of spelling the name rightly represents the sound of it in Hug's *German* text, (*ch* being a strong guttural, almost like *hh*), but gives a mistaken notion of the true name to the English reader. The Thomas in question was of *Ἡράκλεια* (Lat. *Heraclea*, or more usually *Harclea*), a town in Syria, not far from Bambyce or Hierapolis (as the Greeks named it), or Mabug (as the Syrians called it); Cellarius *Orb. Ant.* II. p. 360. *Hierapolis* seems to have been given as a name to Mabug, by the Greeks, because this city was the metropolis of the worship of Astarte or Ashtoreth or Derceto, the fabled goddess of the heathen Syrians.

---

#### NOTE 9. *Principles of Criticism.* (p. 301.)

The assumption by Hug, in this section and the sequel, that all is now settled as to the great leading principles of lower criticism, i. e. that criticism which is employed in the correction of the text, is somewhat surprising, considering the present state of the matter, and indeed its state ever since Mill, Wetstein, Griesbach, and others, have been labouring upon it. We have seen above how little union there has been and is, in respect to the *classification* of Mss.; and yet, on this assumed classification, and (as it appears by p. 302) on the basis of his *own* classification, the worthy author takes it for granted that all difficult questions are at an end. The ground taken by Lachmann, most recently,

and which seems to have the general voice of Germany in its favour, is certainly a very different one from that which Hug has endeavoured to establish. But after what has been said in Note 6, more need not be here said. It is enough merely to repeat in this place, that but little *terra firma* has yet been won, in this department of investigation. The actual internal state of a Ms.; the evidences which itself proffers from its own condition, of correctness and of pains-taking by the copyist; would go much farther, I think, in the mind of an unbiassed person, in determining its weight and value, than the circumstance of the *country* to which it belonged, or (I had almost said) of the *age* to which it belonged. Could not, for example, a copyist at Constantinople, have before him an Alexandrine or an Italian Codex for his exemplar? And so, *mutatis mutandis*, of Alexandria, Rome, and other cities and countries respectively. Could not a copyist of the tenth century, moreover, have before him a Codex of the *fifth* century? Would he not, of course, aim at obtaining the *oldest* and best that he could procure? Surely he would, unless he could obtain such copies of more recent date, as he might be sure were conformed to the oldest and most accurate. How then can we judge of the worth of Mss. merely by their *age*? An exact copy in the tenth century of a Codex belonging to the fifth, is to all intents and purposes the same thing as the ancient Codex itself; so that the *sources* of the later copies, seems to be the most important question in respect to them. As to the *country*, after all that has been said concerning this particular, it weighs but little with me. The present tone of criticism seems to demand, that the Oriental or Constantinopolitan class of Mss. should have the preference. Yet how much dependence can we place upon the ability of men to find out what this class is, so far as it is distinct from other classes, when we are assured by Eusebius himself, that fifty copies of the New Testament were required of him by Constantine, for the use of the churches in his capital? Eusebius, it is well known, was a most devoted friend to the fame and merits of Origen; and his works, like those of Origen, contain quotations from Scripture, which are set down to the account of the *Alexandrine* class of Mss. Supposing now that these fifty copies were made out and sent to Constantinople, as doubtless they were, then would not the Mss. of Constantinople and the neighbouring region afterwards exhibit the *Alexandrine* text? Circumstances like these, surely cast a shade over the whole business of making accurate practical distinctions, at the present day, in the *classification* of manuscripts.

As to the rules or principles of criticism laid down in § 147 seq. (p. 303 seq.), they are perhaps no where else better expressed, or more guardedly formed. Yet there are not a few of them, even as here exhibited, which are to be taken *cum grano salis*. E. g. "That reading of one recension is to be preferred, which agrees *least* with another recension." The reason given for this is, that in later times one recension was frequently interpolated from another. The fact is in itself probably true; but in ascertaining whether a Ms. belongs to a particular recension, (which is the object of the rule just cited), would it not be an *a priori* assumption, that any particular expression is to be preferred to another one, from the very circumstance that it disagrees with a certain recension? How can it be assumed, in any particular case, that a Ms.



is *Alexandrine*, because it disagrees with the *κοινή ἑκδόσις*, or rather, because it disagrees with the so-called Byzantine class? Or why should this *disagreement* be a ground of preference as to a particular reading, unless we could determine *a priori* when and where the Mss. should disagree, in order to be classed with a different recension? Assuming the fact, that we could make out that Ms. A. belongs to the Alexandrine class, and Ms. D. to the occidental class, and that these two classes are different in more or less respects; still, how, in any particular passage, there should be a presumption *a priori* in favour of their disagreement—it would be difficult to shew. *Analogy* will not guide us here. The number of cases in which A. and D. agree, immeasurably exceed those in which they differ. The presumption, therefore, lies fairly on the side of agreement. If then we conclude in favour of a reading in D. which disagrees with one in A., merely because the Mss. belong to different classes, we proceed on grounds of argument like the following, viz. A. and B. sometimes differ: *ergo* the presumption is always in favour of a reading which represents them as differing. Would this be sound logic? Suppose I should argue on the other side thus: A. and B. accord in immeasurably the greater number of cases; *ergo* when they seem to differ, the presumption is against the reading by which they are made to differ. This logic, which would indeed be unsound enough, seems to be at least as well founded as the other. The truth plainly is, that where Mss. of primary value disagree, the only possible ground of estimating a correct reading in either, is analogy of the writer's style, the nature of the Greek idiom and of the particular case to which the passage relates, and the external testimony from ancient quotations. But to say that any reading in one so-called recension, is to be preferred "because it differs most from the reading of another recension," would seem to be laying down a singular and embarrassing, if not dangerous principle of criticism.

Again, Hug (p. 304) says: "That reading of a particular recension is the genuine one, which accords best with the laws of the Greek language, or is most elegant." He doubtless means by this, that particularly Hesychius in his recension, and in a greater or less degree Lucian also in his, helped to remove not a few of the original Hebraisms of the New Testament, and to bring it nearer to the standard of classic Greek. Such readings, then, in these respective recensions, as stand on the side of the classical Greek, are to be regarded as the more probable ones, so far as the character of the particular recension is concerned. This is all well enough, perhaps; but what shall we do with the sequel? In the very next sentence Hug tells us, that "the recensions took their rise from the *κοινή ἑκδόσις* of their country, so that when there are various readings, that is the most probable which agrees most with the *κοινή ἑκδόσις*." Yet this *κοινή* is characterized by Hug himself, as containing much more Hebraism than the recension-copies; nay, one of the very marks of a recension-codex is, that it mitigates the Hebraisms. I do not, however, well see how these two things can stand together. 'That reading in a recension is most probable, which agrees most with the *κοινή ἑκδόσις*;' and yet this *ἑκδόσις* is confessedly full of Hebraism. What next? 'That reading is genuine in a recension, which accords best with the classic Greek.' I wot not how these propositions can be well combined.



On the next page (305) we are told again, that "if the Mss. of the *κοινή ἔκδοσις* agree in a harsh and rude expression, their agreement on it is of more weight than the agreement of the recensions in one more strictly elegant and grammatical." This of course is taking it for granted, that the New Testament writers are prone to harsh and rude expressions, and that the presumption of course is always in favour of them. This would be going quite far enough in presumption, to say the least. Such a principle or rule is plainly expressed in a manner too absolute or unqualified. If the so called *rudeness* or *harshness* were mere Hebraism, I should be inclined to apply the rule; if it were not, I should consider it as by no means binding upon my judgment.

Once more; Hug says, that "it is a universally admitted principle, that we should incline to that reading which is encompassed by exegetical difficulties." It is well that he afterwards qualifies this, by admitting that there must be sufficient testimony in the Mss. to shew that the difficult reading did not originate from a mere blunder of the scribes. Otherwise the rule would lead us to monstrosity in criticism. E. g. in Is. 9: 2, "Thou hast increased the nation [i. e. the Jewish people]; *לֹא הִגְדַּלְתָּ הַשְׂמֵחָה*, lit. *thou hast not increased their joy*;" and yet, in the very next clause it is said, "They rejoice before thee with a joy like that of harvest-time, as they rejoice who divide the spoil," i. e. with great or unusual joy. Now the middle clause here, as literally rendered, directly contradicts the latter clauses, and likewise the tenor of the whole passage. There can be no doubt, therefore, as there is none among most critics of the present day, that *אֵל*, in the present Heb. text, has been carelessly written for *יָל*, both of them being read with the same sound, *lō*. But if *יָל* be the correct reading, then the sense of the second clause is, "Thou hast increased its [the nation's] joy;" which accords entirely with the context and design of the whole passage.

Here, then, if we prefer *אֵל* (*not*) because it is the more difficult reading, we make either nonsense or incongruity in the text. And this is a case, too, which Hug's exception does not touch; for here the Heb. Mss. are altogether predominant in favour of *אֵל*. How can we bind ourselves, now, in such bonds as these? The nature of the case, and the congruity of any reading with the evident design of the writer and scope of the passage, will plainly weigh more with the mind of a discerning reader, than all the accidental and external circumstances or witnesses. Yet this privilege of judging must be exercised with real and with much caution; and the design of the writer must be so plain, that there is hardly room for any doubt among honest and intelligent minds.

What Hug says in § 150, might be qualified by many remarks. "The recensions," he says, "maintain a far higher authority than the existing Mss. of the *κοινή ἔκδοσις*." Why should they? One object of recensions, as expressly stated by Hug, was to get rid of Hebraisms and ungrammatical and harsh expressions, etc. Why should this make them *more* authoritative? Plainly it would make them less so. Hug, however, puts their authority of course on another ground. He says, that the authors of the recensions undoubtedly collated several Mss. of the *κοινή*. The recensions, then, are grounded on the *κοινή ἔκδοσις*, and this gives them weight. Why then have not the *κοιναι ἔκδοσις*, which

have been copied and come down to us in this way, as much authority as the text gathered from them and which has descended in the same manner? Who can vouch for the critical acumen and fair dealing in all cases, of the authors and copyists of the recensions?

Many other remarks of a similar character might be made upon Hug's rules of criticism; which surely need to be qualified, and are to be received with much caution. That caution is, I am pleased to say it, suggested by Hug himself, on p. 397, § 151. He admits that we must be guided principally by a minute study of each particular writer, in all his particular characteristic developments of sentiment, diction, use of particles, grammatical construction, etc., when we come to describe what most probably belongs, or does not belong, to the text of any particular passage. He admits that critical feeling or sensibility also may be something in this matter. And to these two sources or means of criticism, I should trust more in the determination of a reading, in respect to which the Codices differ, than to the weight of all the Codices in favour of this or that mode of reading, so far as these are simply considered merely as Codices.

All those rules of Hug, which have for their basis a practicable and actual classification of Mss., and which assign peculiar weight to some in consequence of belonging to a particular class, I must regard as little better than a *petitio principii*, in the whole matter of New Testament criticism. *Lis sub judice*; and while it is so, and is confessedly and plainly so in the judgment of so many impartial and enlightened critics, why should we speak, and argue, and lay down rules, as if it were not so?

NOTE 10. *Explanations inserted by the Evangelists in the text, for the sake of rendering it intelligible to their readers. (p. 321).*

The characteristics which Hug here gives of the various Gospels, generally speaking, may perhaps be true. But when he states that 'it is not the custom of Matthew to insert any thing by way of explanation, where *Hebrew* readers did not need it,' he is surely in an error, if the passage in Matth. 1: 23 be genuine, viz. Ἐμμανουὴλ ὃ ἐστὶ μεθερμηνεύμενον, μεθ' ἡμῶν ὁ θεός. Did the Hebrews of Palestine, then, need to have Ἐμμανουὴλ translated in order to understand it?

Those who maintain that the original Gospel of Matthew was written in Hebrew, and that the present is a mere translation of it, would doubtless reply, that this clause has been added by the translator. But Hug, who does not accede to this view of the original language of Matthew's Gospel, has offered no solution of the difficulty which seems to be thrown in the way of his hypothesis by such a clause; about which, I may add, there is no variety in Mss. or fathers, which deserves any regard.

But this is not all. Matthew repeats the words of Jesus on the cross: Ἠλί! Ἠλί! λαμὰ σαβαχθανί, and then adds the translation into Greek, i. e. τοῦτ' ἐστὶ Θεέ μου! Θεέ μου! ἵνατί με ἐγκατέλιπες; Was it pos-

sible that a Jew needed to be told what the Hebrew words in question meant? Surely not. If Matthew originally wrote in Hebrew, it would seem of course to follow, that these explanations must have been inserted by his translator. If he wrote in Greek, then it is his custom sometimes to insert explanations which a Hebrew reader did not need. And this would be a different position from that assumed by Hug. Compare also, Matt. 27: 8; why did not the writer say here, *Ἀκελδαμά*, as in Acts 1: 19?

In Matt. 27: 15, the writer states, that "the governor was wont to release unto the people a prisoner, whom they would." Did a Jew need to be told this? Again; in Matt. 27: 33 the writer says, "they came to a place called *Golgotha*, that is to say, *A place of a scull*." Did a Jew need to have this translated? Once more; in Matt. 28: 15 it is said: "This saying is commonly reported among the Jews, until this day." Did a native of Judea need to be told this?

The peculiar characteristics, then, which Hug has so positively attributed here to Matthew, are more than doubtful. No other Gospel, except perhaps John's, resorts oftener to explanations. Is it not better to read and observe for ourselves, than to take the declarations of others upon credit, about matters like these?

NOTE 11. *References to the fulfilment of Old Testament prophecies in the Gospels.* (p. 312, § 3.)

The reader may judge for himself how much reality there is in this statement, from the following comparison; in which I have selected only those passages where the writer has expressly referred us to the Old Testament Scriptures, by a *ἵνα πληρωθῇ* or a *ὅπως πληρωθῇ*, etc.

Matthew, 1: 22. 2: 15. 2: 17. 2: 23. 4: 14. 8: 17. 12: 17. 13: 35. 21: 4. 26: 56. 27: 9. 27: 35; in all, *twelve* instances.

Mark, 14: 49. 15: 28; only *two* cases.

Luke, 4: 21. 21: 22. 24: 44; in all, *three* cases.

This shews, indeed, a great difference in the habitudes of the different writers, as to expressly referring to the Old Testament Scriptures. It would seem to argue, at least, that Matthew had specially to do with those who drew their views of the Messiah from ancient scriptural interpretations.

NOTE 12. *Summaries made by Matthew in his Gospel.* (p. 313 § 4.)

I do not deny that what Hug has here stated is specious; nor even that in most cases it seems to be substantially correct. Take for example the collection of parables, in chap. XIII. XIV. XVIII. XX. XXI. XXII. XXV. Yet even here, these are uttered on so many different occasions,

that we are led to hesitate respecting the full application of the principle laid down by Hug. But when he applies this same rule of comparison to the Sermon on the Mount, and says that 'it is now admitted that this discourse is fragmentary,' he says what is indeed true as to some critics; for there are some who agree with him in respect to this point. Others, however, there are, who think quite differently in respect to the Sermon on the Mount. The reader will find an ample and able discussion of this matter, in Tholuck's Commentary on this Sermon, which has been recently published, § 2. His judgment is the reverse of Hug's; and such, I apprehend, will henceforth be the judgment of almost every unprejudiced and critical reader. The only arguments which seem to have any weight, are, that Luke's account of the Sermon on the Mount is so much more brief than that of Matthew; and that there are various declarations in the Sermon exhibited by Matthew, which are scattered here and there over the Gospel of Luke. Tholuck has done full justice to these points; and he has shewn how little force such arguments can have in the determination of the question, Whether the Sermon on the Mount is *one whole*, or only made up of *fragments*? The substance of his argument is, that proverbial declarations, common maxims, etc., contained in Matthew's account of the Sermon on the Mount, were and must have been not unfrequently *repeated* on other occasions.

That strict *chronological* order was not intended to be followed by this writer, is affirmed by Hug; and, as I fully believe, with good reason. Well does he compare the manner of Matthew's Gospel, with the *Memorabilia* of Socrates by Xenophon. There is, in many respects, a striking resemblance.

NOTE 13. *Time when the Gospel of Matthew was written.* (p. 313. § 5.)

Of all the circumstances which Hug mentions as indicating the *late* period at which the Gospel of Matthew was written, (he places it on the eve of the destruction of Jerusalem, i. e. about A.D. 70), there seems to be not more than one or two which will bear examination. When Matthew (27: 8) says: "Wherefore that field was called the field of blood, ἕως τῆς σήμερον"; and again in 28: 15 says: "This report was spread abroad among the Jews, μέχρι τῆς σήμερον"; it is natural to conclude, that the writer would have resorted to such a mode of expression, only after a considerable time had elapsed, subsequently to the death of Jesus. However, 20 or 25 years would seem to be sufficient to account for this.

It is possible, that the circumstances related in Matt. 27: 15 respecting the governor's releasing a prisoner on the feast-day of the Jews, might have been inserted by the writer some 20 or 25 years after Pilate had ceased to be governor, in order to remind the Jews of an almost forgotten custom. But I do not interpret the matter as Hug does. I suppose this to have been a custom common to all the Roman govern-



ors of the Jews, and that Matthew notes this circumstance in order that all his readers might be advertised of it; some of whom, as we must naturally suppose, he had reason to presume were ignorant of it, because they were not familiar with the usages of the Jewish government.

The amount of what is said by Hug concerning the case of Zacharias, the son of Barachias, is, that Matthew has committed an error in the narration. Instead of representing Jesus as saying (in respect to the future), *ὃν πορεύεσθε κ. τ. λ.*, i. e. *whom ye will hereafter kill*, Matthew, who, as Hug supposes, wrote after the murder had already taken place, falls out (as grammarians say) of his construction, and represents Jesus as declaring a *past event*, viz., *ὃν ἐπορεύσατε κ. τ. λ.*

That such a view of the subject is adapted to give satisfaction to the mind, can hardly be admitted. First of all it may be said, that the Zacharias mentioned by Josephus was a *politician*, and an influential man, and was taken off by the Zealots, not because of his religion or piety, but because of his political influence and his wealth. Moreover this same Zacharias, when accused by the Zealots before the Sanhedrim, was acquitted by them, and was murdered afterwards by only two of the most daring Zealots. Besides all this, the murder of Zacharias was only one event in a long series of the like ones. After this event, Gorion, Niger, and other distinguished men were destroyed in the same way. All these circumstances serve to shew, that Jesus could not have referred, in his address to the Jews, to this Zacharias; for the one whom he presents, is one who had been a martyr in the cause of truth and of piety. But, what is more than all, a reference to a murder to be committed by the Jews some forty years after the address of Jesus to them, could not be a matter in point between the speaker and those whom he addressed. It must be a murder well known to them, and of which they would have a distinct recollection, the moment it was mentioned. And besides all this, as the murder of Abel was the *first* in a series described by the Saviour, so the murder of Zacharias must be the *last* in the series indicated. This could not apply, then, to the Zacharias named in Josephus, whose death was yet future, and which, when it did happen, was by no means the last in the series to which it belonged.

An interpretation fraught with so many difficulties, therefore, as this of Hug, cannot be safely admitted; not to mention, that the inspiration of the Evangelist is virtually called in question by it, as it shews him to have committed a palpable oversight; and one, I may add, respecting what seems to have been a very plain matter and well known even by the populace.

Nor do I think the solution of the difficulty to be much better, which is proffered by Theile in Winer and Engelhardt's *Kritisches Journal* (II. p. 415 seq.); which is, that Matthew, meaning to refer to Zacharias the son of Jehoida the priest, who, in the reign of Joash, was stoned to death in the court of the house of the Lord (2 Chron. 24: 20, 21), by a lapse of memory calls him *the son of Barachias*; thus confounding him with Zachariah the son of Barachiah the author of the book of prophecy which bears this name, or else with Zachariah the son of Jeberechiah, mentioned in Is. 8: 2. Although this solution seems to be allowed by Schott in his *Isagoge* (p. 81), and by Bretschneider in his *Lexicon* (v. *Zacharias*), and to be suggested as one mode of solving the

difficulty even by Mill in his New Testament (p. 52), yet it appears to me to be quite improbable. It seems much more natural to suppose, that the Zachariah mentioned by the Saviour was a *later* martyr than the one mentioned in 2 Chron. 24: 20, and one whose history tradition had preserved. It is no objection to this, that Josephus is silent respecting such an individual. How many other things he passes over in silence, which we know to have occurred, need not be suggested to the critical examiner.

More improbable still should I deem Hug's exegesis of *βδελύγμα τῆς ἐρεμώσεως*, as exhibited on p. 315 seq. It is somewhat surprising, that on p. 315 the worthy author exhibits the verse which contains these words, as being part of the address of Jesus himself to the Jews; and on p. 316 as being *an apostrophe of the evangelist*. Where this apostrophe stops, he does not tell us, unless he means that we shall limit it to the words which he has quoted. But this is impossible; for the words that follow in a long sequel, are indissolubly connected with the words which he regards as an apostrophe.

Then again, to construe *βδελύγμα ἐρεμώσεως* as meaning the Zealots, who obtained possession of the temple and profaned it, is, I apprehend, giving a totally different turn to the words, from that which Daniel, and after him the Saviour, meant to give. I take it to be altogether probable, if not certain, that a *foreign* power is designated by these words, who is thus in effect called *the horrible destroyer*. What else can the proverbial saying in v. 28, respecting the *eagles*, mean, unless it is *paronomasiac*, and has reference to the eagles painted on the Roman standards?

The general, almost the universal, voice of antiquity proclaims, that Matthew was the first in order of all the Evangelists. It is only late writers, however, who name a specific early period; e. g. Cosmas Indicopleustes (Cent. VI.) names, as the period when this Gospel was composed, the time when Stephen suffered martyrdom; Theophylact (Cent. XI.) the *eighth* year after the ascension; Euthymius Zigabenus (Cent. XII.), the same; and Nicephorus (Cent. XIV.), the *fifteenth* year after the ascension. The most probable time, all things considered, seems to be somewhere between A.D. 50 and A. D. 60. More exactly it cannot be fixed; nor even here with any very definite certainty.

NOTE 14. *Gospel according to the Hebrews.* (p. 320, § 9.)

The development of this subject by Hug has some good traits. The striking part of the subject is well presented. But the reader is left entirely at a loss how the Ebionites differed from the Nazarenes, or what was the connection of these two sects; or in fact whether they were actually two. On the contrary, Hug even suggests (p. 326), that "both [sects] were accused of the *same* Jewish fanaticism, etc." The author seems, therefore, either not to have read, or not to have approved, the

recent able essays on the subject of the Nazarenes and Ebionites, which have appeared in his country.

From these it would seem now to be made out, that the great body of Jewish Christians in *Palestine*, after the destruction of the Jewish capital by the Romans, continued to hold the necessity of observing the Mosaic ritual. But the *extent* to which this observance should go, was a question about which a difference of opinion arose among them. The more liberal and enlightened, especially those who lived at and near Jerusalem in the first part of the second century, embraced the opinion, that the law of Moses was obligatory only upon *Jewish* Christians, not upon Gentile ones. Another party held to its *universal* obligation, even in its most rigid form. The former were called *Nazarenes*, the latter *Ebionites*. The Ebionites of course rejected the writings of Paul, because they supersede all the ritual of the law. They moreover held that Jesus was the natural son of Joseph, on whom Christ descended at his baptism; and in whom he dwelt. Another feature of their creed is said to have been, the expectation of a civil and temporal millennium under the Messiah. But this is recently called in question by Credner in his *Beiträge*.

The Nazarenes on the other hand, held to the miraculous conception of Jesus, and that the Gentiles should be freed from all obligation to the ritual law.

It would seem that both these sects had a *Gospel according to the Hebrews*, or (as it is sometimes called) a *Gospel of the twelve Apostles*, a *Gospel of Peter*, or *κατὰ Ματθαῖον*; which appears to have been current among them at a very early period, even before they had separated from each other. After their separation each party seems to have added to it, or detracted from it, according to their respective tenets and purposes. The Nazarenes used, according to Epiphanius, the fuller or more copious recension; the Ebionites abridged this work, by removing the genealogy in Matt. i. and also some other passages, and inserting others more consonant with their tenets. But whether this apocryphal Gospel was originally that of Matthew written in *Hebrew*, as some suppose, and mutilated or interpolated by these sects so as to suit their own views; or whether it was the *Greek* Gospel of Matthew (if that were the *original* one), translated and either abridged or interpolated, as others suppose; or whether, as others are inclined to believe, the basis of the whole production was the work of another author than Matthew, who merely imitated him and took many *excerpta* from him; these are questions which do not appear, as yet, to be fully cleared up to the satisfaction of all the learned. The latter opinion seems to me quite the most probable one. At all events, it is clear that Origen and Eusebius considered the *Gospel according to the Hebrews* as spurious, *ρόθρον*; Orig. Comm. in Johan. IV. p. 63, ed. La Rue; Euseb. Hist. Ecc. III. 25.

On the whole, one thing seems to be quite plain, viz. that no argument of any validity can be derived from the existence and circulation of this spurious Gospel in the Palestine dialect of that time, which will have any important bearing on the question, In what language was Matthew's Gospel originally written? The differences between the *τὸ κατὰ Ἑβραίους εὐαγγέλιον*, and our present Gospel of Matthew are so

striking, in so far as we are able to make them out from the remains of the former, that we cannot assume substantial identity between the two without great hazard of error. The question as to the *original* language of Matthew's work, must stand therefore on another basis, i. e. be settled, if this can be done, by other means than these.

The reader is referred, for more extensive information, to Lange, *Die Juden-Christen, Ebioniten, und Nicolaiten, der apostolischen Zeit*, Leip. 1828. Van Heyst, *Diss. theol. de Judæo-Christianismo* etc., Lugd. Bat. 1828. Olshausen, *Die Echtheit der vier Canon. Evangelien*, etc., Koenigsb. 1823, p. 30 seq. Gieseler, *Die Nazaræer und Ebioniten*, in Archiv für alte und neue Kirchengeschichte, Von Stäudlin und Tzschirner, IV. 1819. Credner, *Ueber Essæer und Ebioniten*, in Winer's Zeitschrift für wissenschaft. Theologie, 2 heft, 1827, 3 heft, 1829.

This last author (Credner) has recently published a work entitled *Beiträge zur Einleitung in die biblischen Schriften*, Halle, 1832, in which he has gone very deep into the early evidences of the state of the New Testament text in the second and third centuries. The main object of the first volume (no more have come to hand), is to shew, that there was a different Gospel from any of our present *canonical* ones, in circulation among the early *Hebrew* Christians of Palestine, one which he calls a *Petrine Gospel*. He does not seem to mean by this, that Peter was actually the author of it, but that it had credit as being supposed to have been approved by him, or at any rate as containing sentiments like those which he exhibited when Paul contended with him because of his avowing Jewish notions respecting the law; Gal. 2: 11 seq. As to this *Petrine Gospel*, Credner labours through his volume to shew, that it was the one made use of by Justin Martyr, in the Clementine Homilies, in the Clementine Recognitions, in Tatian's Diatesseron, and in the *Κήρυγμα Πέτρου*; many citations also in the works of Clemens Alexandrinus and of Origen, seem, as he hints, to accord with this. The *Codex Bezae* also, i. e. the *Codex D.* of Griesbach and others, with great ability and acuteness he labours to shew, must have been copied from a recension which was greatly modified, or in many parts conformed, to the *Petrine Gospel*, or to some peculiar Gospel current among Jewish Christians.

So far as our present topic is concerned it is sufficient to say, that he is fully of the opinion, that the *Εὐαγγέλιον κατ' Ἑβραίους*, which was in use among the Nazarenes and Ebionites, was a book entirely different as to its origin from our Gospel of Matthew; and different also from the *Κήρυγμα Πέτρου* or the *Εὐαγγέλιον Πέτρου*. At the same time, by far the greater part of the *Petrine Gospel* or the *Gospel according to the Hebrews* actually resembled our three first canonical Gospels, and particularly the Gospel of Matthew; and so the quotations from them often agree. Yet there are additions and detractions in these apocryphal Gospels, which savour of the heresy of the Docetae, and give a different turn to some sentiments in the canonical Gospels which are peculiarly evangelical.

The whole book, whatever may be thought of the *solidity* of the author's positions, is highly distinguished for learning and critical acumen; and if its main positions should prove to be well grounded, it will change the whole face of criticism in regard to the early state of our



New Testament text, and throw much that has been adduced as evidence of it, as it now exists in our present recensions, entirely into the back ground. For example; the author labours, at great length and with much acuteness, to shew that Justin's quotations are all from a *Petrine Gospel*, and not from our canonical ones. If this be true, it would follow of course that the quotations of Justin cannot be appealed to as evidences of the state of our canonical text. But in respect to the very numerous quotations from Justin, occupying 58 octavo pages, the author assumes a principle of reasoning which needs to be well discussed and more thoroughly considered, before it can be allowed in all the latitude in which he has applied it, viz. the principle, that wherever the quotations of Justin *differ* from our canonical Gospels, there it is clear he must have had another Gospel from which he quoted, that differed from ours; and wherever the quotations of Justin *agree* with our canonical text, that is evidence merely of the sameness in many respects between the Petrine Gospel which he used and our present Evangelists, but not evidence that he quoted from the canonical Gospels. My own persuasion at first view, is, that this is assuming a great deal too much; and that the *agreement* in Justin is so immeasurably predominant over the *disagreement*, that I can well solve any difficulty which the latter presents, by attributing it to *memoriter* quotations.\* And as a voucher for this, I would appeal to Justin's quotations from the Old Testament, and to those of Clemens Romanus also, where the same phenomena are on all sides apparent. Why should we excogitate new reasons for such diversity in quotation, when the old ones are sufficient? Or why adopt a rule in respect to New Testament quotations, which will not apply to the Old Testament ones?

Prof. Credner's book, however, is one of deep interest to the critic. The second volume (not received) is designed to give an account of the Greek Versions of the Old Testament, current among the Christian Churches from A.D. 150 to A.D. 250, with special reference to the Gospels. The third volume (of its publication I am not aware) is to contain discussions respecting the origin or *genetic* rise of the Gospels, the dialect in which they are written, the authors of the Gospels canonical and apocryphal, etc.; a work that must be full of interest, when in such hands as those of Credner. And this will be true, whether the *theory* he adopts be right or wrong; for in whatever direction he moves, he never makes an idle or insignificant movement. I can scarcely doubt that the criticism of the New Testament will be much modified by it; at least this will be the case, if we can judge by the specimen already before us.

But to return more directly to our main object; the question, what was the *original* language of Matthew's Gospel, is one which is open for investigation, independently of any of the *apocryphal* Gospels current in the Hebrew language among the Jewish Christians of early times. It remains to be seen, whether there is a probability that Matthew could and would have written his Gospel in Greek. The 10th section in Hug sheds some important light on this part of our inquiries. It can scarcely be doubted, after reading and well examining this, that a know-

\* Of like opinion I find De Wette to be, in his *Einleit. ins. N. Test.* § 67.

ledge of Greek, such as was attained by all classes of men in a popular way, viz., by hearing it *spoken*, and having occasion more or less to employ it, was widely diffused among the inhabitants of the larger towns in Palestine. The scattered residents in small villages and country places, could hardly have occasion to be much conversant with Greek; and therefore we cannot naturally suppose them to have been well acquainted with it. Accident or curiosity, however, would of course lead now and then a person even in such places, to obtain a practical knowledge of it. More than this would seem hardly probable; and more need not be supposed.

NOTE. 15. *Original language of Matthew's Gospel.* (pp. 339 seq.)

As every critical enquirer may well be expected to feel some special interest in this subject, I would subjoin a few remarks in addition to what Hug has said in §§ 8—12.

On pp. 318 seq. the reader will find the leading testimonies of the ancient fathers, on which dependence has been principally placed, in order to prove that Matthew wrote his Gospel in *Hebrew*, i. e. in the Palestine dialect of his time, which was a mixture of ancient Hebrew, Chaldee, and Syriac.

The leading writers in modern times, who have defended this proposition, are Simon, Mill, Michaelis, Weber, Elsner, Bolten, Adler, Corrodi, Storr, Haenlein, Eichhorn, Bertholdt, Schmidt, Olshausen, Cave, Harwood, Owen, Campbell, and A. Clarke: to which we may also add Grotius, Bellarmin, Casaubon, Walton, and Tillemont.

On the other side of the question, viz. in favour of a *Greek* original, are Erasmus, Paraeus, Calvin, Le Clerc, Fabricius, Pfeiffer, Lightfoot, Beausobre, Basnage, Wetstein, Rumpaeus, Hoffman, Leusden, Masch, Vogel, C. F. Schmid, Gabler, Paulus, Jones, Jortin, Lardner, Hey, Hales, and, among living authors, Hug, Schott, and De Wette (in his latest *Einleitung*).

Guerike at Halle, and Dr. Townson in England, suppose Matthew to have written *two* originals, the one Hebrew and the other Greek. Bengel long ago said: *Quid obstat, quo minus idem [Matthaeus] Graece eundem librum, eodem exemplo scripserit.*" Bengel means to say that Matthew may have written both in Hebrew and in Greek, on the same Ms.; *Gnomon Nov. Testamenti*, p. 2.

From an attentive survey of the *ancient* testimony, as cited by Hug (p. 318 seq.), it is plain that there was a tradition widely diffused, in the early ages, that Matthew wrote his Gospel in *Hebrew*. Yet from a more minute examination of this tradition, it would seem to be quite probable, that the declaration of Papias (cited on p. 318) was the principal thing which gave rise to it. Irenaeus had great faith in the declarations of Papias; as Hug has shewn, and as the manner in which Irenaeus speaks of him shews. From these two early fathers, the report concerning a *Hebrew* original naturally spread wide abroad. The *value*

of it, however, must be estimated, as it seems to me, by the original testimony of Papias.

Eusebius, who in Ecc. Hist. III. 39 produces this testimony, himself calls Papias a man *πάνυ σμικρὸν τὸν νοῦν*, i. e. a kind of *simpleton*. Still, this might not injure the credibility of his testimony as to a mere matter of fact. But if there was already a translation of Matthew's *Greek Gospel* into *Hebrew*; or if there was already in circulation the *εὐαγγέλιον Πέτρου*, or (to give it another name) the *εὐαγγέλιον καθ' Ἑβραίους*, which gospel was doubtless in circulation among a certain class of Judaizing Christians, and was often named *κατὰ Ματθαῖον* and *κατὰ ἀποστόλους* by the early writers, and which indeed bore many strong resemblances to the canonical Gospel of Matthew; then was it very easy for this witness, being *πάνυ σμικρὸς τὸν νοῦν* as he seems to have been, to be misled, while he was at the same time very honest and upright in his testimony.

There is only one other early testimony besides those produced, which seems to stand on a different basis. It is the passage of Eusebius in Ecc. Hist. V. 10, in which he speaks of Pantaenus as 'having gone to India (probably he means *southern Arabia*), where he found that the Gospel of Matthew had been circulated, being left there by Bartholomew, one of the twelve apostles, and existing *ἐν αὐτοῖς Ἑβραίων γράμμασιν*; [which he brought back with him']. But in regard to this story, Eusebius commences it by saying: *λόγος εὐρεῖν αὐτὸν τὸ κατὰ Ματθαῖον εὐαγγέλιον*, i. e. *report says*, etc., or *there is a report*, etc. Language like this he could not well be supposed to employ, in case he viewed the matter as a well-grounded certainty. Of course a writer resorts to an expression of this nature, only when he does not mean to be considered as standing voucher for the truth of the thing which he is about to relate. He may even actually consider this thing as probable, or regard it as improbable; but by such a mode of expressing himself he avoids giving his own opinion upon it.

The clause in brackets above, is not to be found in the original of Eusebius; but it is added by Rufinus, and also by Jerome. It asserts, however, what is an utter improbability; for how can we suppose that the *Hebrew* original of Matthew was brought out of southern Arabia (India) to Egypt, by Pantaenus, and yet that Origen should say nothing on this subject, nor Clemens Alexandrinus, the celebrated and favourite pupil of Pantaenus himself, say a word about such a matter? The thing seems to be fairly out of question.

We seem to be left, then, in our ultimate resort, to the testimony of Papias, from whom the story of a *Hebrew Gospel* by Matthew originated, and was successively handed down to the other fathers, through Irenaeus. The question now remains: Do the *circumstances of the case* conspire to render such a Gospel probable?

Hug has shewn, amply and I should think conclusively, that *Greek* was very extensively spoken in Palestine, during the apostolic ages. Circumstances which are noticed in Note 14 above, serve to shew, that Matthew can not well be supposed to have had only Jewish readers in view, when he wrote his Gospel. The explanations which he gives of certain things, would be superfluous to Jews brought up in Palestine; and these only continued to speak the *Hebrew* language of those times.

That Palestine readers in general would not be excluded from the privilege of reading his Gospel, provided it were written in *Greek*, would seem to be nearly certain, not only from the facts detailed by Hug in § 10, but from Acts 21: 40. 22: 2, where, although the multitude of Jews surrounding Paul testified their satisfaction at being addressed by him in the Hebrew language, yet the natural implication of the whole narrative is, that they expected he would speak to them in Greek, and that they would have understood him in case he had done so. But it was more in the spirit of a *Hebrew* to address them in the Hebrew tongue; and so they gave him the more ready audience because he did thus.

After the almost endless confusion and obscurity which exists in the older essays on this subject, by reason of *conjectures* respecting the *εὐαγγέλιον κατ' Ἑβραίους*, *εὐαγγέλιον κατὰ ἀποστόλους*, *εὐαγγέλιον Πέτρου*, and the so-called *εὐαγγέλιον κατὰ Ματθαῖον*, current among the Nazarenes and Ebionites, there seems at last to be some light springing up, which promises to make our way clear. Credner has shewn in his *Beiträge* above described, that these various appellations are in all probability but names of one and the same work, somewhat interpolated, or altered, or mutilated, by the different sects among Jewish Christians, and that the work was current among the more strenuous Judaizers especially, in the *Hebrew* language of the day; see particularly pp. 363—414 of Credner's work. Whatever may be the extent which we may rationally attribute to the Greek language in Palestine, yet we cannot with probability assume it as a matter of fact, that *all* the common people were acquainted with it. Even if they were, there would be good reason still to believe, that the Nazarenes and Ebionites, who held themselves aloof from Christians whose sympathies were with those of Paul on the subject of Jewish rites and ceremonies, would not have deemed it decorous or proper to make use of writings as *sacred*, which existed only in the *Greek* language. On every ground, the vernacular language of the Jews would naturally be deemed preferable; for it was more intelligible, it was more sacred.

Hence the *εὐαγγέλιον Πέτρου*, a work probably of the apostolic age, possibly one to which Luke himself adverts in the commencement of his Gospel, was early *translated*. I say *translated*; for the evidence produced by Credner (p. 455 and elsewhere) serves to shew satisfactorily that the *Hebrew* copies were a translation from a Greek original. E. g. the Greek proper name in Matt. 27: 16, *Βαρῶαββᾶν*, the Hebrew Gospel of the Nazarines translates (according to Jerome, Comm. in Matt. 27: 16), with the sense of *filiius magistri eorum*; which proper name, of course, the translator must have supposed was derived from *בַּר רַבִּי*, instead of being the usual Hebrew name *בֶּרֶךְ אֲבָהֶם*, i. e. *νόον διδασκάλου*. There seems to have been no room for mistake here, to a Hebrew who was writing in his own vernacular dialect. The sense therefore given to *Βαραββᾶς* or *Βαρῶαββᾶς* is plainly one, which indicates the mistake of a translator as to the etymology of a Greek word.

Very early then there was current among the Judaizing Christians a gospel written at first in Greek, and afterwards translated for the use of Jewish readers into the Hebrew of the day; which from its resemblance to our canonical Matthew, and from the fact that it was more generally



current in the second and following centuries in the *Hebrew* language, was usually named by other Christians who believed with Paul, or (in other words) by the church catholic, *εὐαγγέλιον κατὰ Ματθαῖον*. Of most of this we are altogether certain from the testimony of Jerome. In his book *De Viris Illustribus*, cap. 2, he says: "Evangelium quoque, quod appellatur *secundum Hebraeos*, et a me nuper in *Graecum Latinumque sermonem translatum est*; quo et Origenes saepe utitur, etc." From which it appears, that Jerome, in his time, did not know of, or could not procure a *Greek* copy; for then the work of translating this would have been superfluous. But that there were copies of this nature in circulation, seems to be clear from the fact which Theodoret states, viz. that he procured a large number of copies of the *Diatesseron* of Tatian, who seems to have used the Gospel of Peter as his basis, which were in circulation in his diocese, and gave to the owners *canonical* Gospels in their stead; Haeret. Fab. I. 20.

The passage in Jerome, which is the plainest and most direct that he has any where exhibited, is in one of his *latest* works (*Contra Pelagium*, 3. 2), written in 415, four years before his death. It runs thus: "In evangelio *juxta Hebraeos* quod *Chaldaico quidem Syroque sermone*, sed *Hebraicis literis* scriptum est, quo utuntur usque hodie Nazareni, *secundum apostolos*, sive (ut plerique autumant) *juxta Matthaeum*; quod et in Caesariensi habetur bibliotheca." Again, in his Comm. in Matt. 12: 13 he says: "Quod [evangelium secundum Hebraeos] vocatur a plerisque *Matthaei authenticum*." In his book *De Viris Illust.*, cap. 3, he says, that 'there was a copy of this gospel in the library at Caesarea, and that he had also obtained one from the Nazarenes in Beroea, a city of Syria.' This was doubtless the one from which he made his translation into Latin and Greek.

The way seems now to be open for explaining how there came to be so widely diffused a report among the ancient Christian fathers, respecting an *original* of Matthew's Gospel being extant in the *Hebrew* language. The *εὐαγγέλιον κατὰ Ματθαῖον*, or *εὐαγγέλιον Πέτρου*, or *εὐαγγέλιον κατ' ἀποστόλους*, or *εὐαγγέλιον κατ' Ἑβραίους*, (all different names of what appears to have been one and the same work differently modified in various hands, as E. F. Schmidt, in his *Hist. antiq. et Vind. Canonis*, p. 439 seq., some half a century since maintained), greatly resembled in its leading features our canonical Matthew. It was usually called by Matthew's name (*κατὰ Ματθαῖον*), and thus was given out by those who used it as his authentic work; "a plerisque *Matthaei authenticum* [vocatur]", says Jerome in Comm. in Matt. 12: 13. It was nearly of the same extent with the genuine Gospel of Matthew; for Nicephorus of Byzantium, about A.D. 800, mentions this *Gospel of the Hebrews* (or *κατὰ Ματθαῖον*) as one of the *ἀντιλεγόμενα*, but not as one of the *apocryphal* books, and says that it contains 2200 *στίχοι*, while to our canonical Matthew he assigns 2500 *στίχοι*. So long did this work preserve some credit among a part of professed Christians.

Add to all this now the very important circumstance, that none of the fathers except Jerome even pretend to have seen and read the *κατὰ Ματθαῖον* Gospel in the Hebrew; and this for the best of all reasons, viz. that none of them but he were able to read it in this language.

Hence every thing must have depended on the current report of those who used the Hebrew Gospel *κατὰ Ματθαῖον*. They of course contended for its *authenticity*; and its resemblance to the canonical Matthew might even have made it doubtful to a somewhat discerning reader, whether the *basis* of it might not have been the work of Matthew, because of the resemblance which it bore to his canonical Gospel. Even Jerome himself, after he had translated this Gospel *κατὰ Ἑβραίων*, does not seem prepared in his mind to give a full and positive opinion, whether the real Gospel of Matthew might not have been the *basis*. Most abundantly do his remarks and quotations from it shew, that it had been tampered with by omissions and additions. But whether the genuine Matthew was its original basis, is a question on which he appears to have thought differently at different times; owing probably to the circumstance, that before he obtained a copy of it he was guided by general report, but after he had read and compared it, he judged it to be spurious.

This difference in his opinion is strongly marked by the manner in which, at different times, he expresses himself about the *dialect* of the Gospel *κατὰ Ἑβραίων*. In his earlier works he speaks of this as being *Hebraeo sermone*. But in a late work of his (*Contra Iulag.* III. 2), four years before his death, he gives us, with more minute accuracy, an account of the real state of this matter: "In evangelio juxta Hebraeos, quod *Chaldaico* quidem et *Syro sermone*, sed *Hebraicis literis* scriptum est." In the *Chaldee* and *Syriac* idiom, then, i. e. in the mixt idiom (as I understand this) made up of these two languages, which was every where predominant in the northern and eastern part of Palestine, the Gospel in question was written, although the letters were *Hebrew*. All this is just what the Jews still practise. The German Jews print many of their books which are written in the *German* language, by employing Hebrew letters; the Turkish Jews, who speak *Spanish*, print their books with Hebrew letters; and if this is now done in respect to languages so discrepant from the Hebrew, how much more natural was it to write a Syro-Chaldaic book, in the early ages of Christianity, with the Hebrew alphabet which tallied exactly with the alphabets of those two dialects. The reader will note, that Jerome, in his minute and circumstantial description, plainly designs to distinguish between the proper Hebrew tongue and the Syro-Chaldaic.

After all, then, the report of a Gospel of Matthew being extant in the proper *Hebrew* of the apostle's time, seems to have no just foundation; but a Syro-Chaldaic Gospel of this nature, most clearly was current among the Nazarenes and Ebionites.

Thus much for the ground of ancient report, respecting the *Hebrew* Gospel of Matthew. Let us now sum up, very briefly, the considerations which speak positively in favour of a *Greek* original.

I. If a *Syro-Chaldaic* original of Matthew's canonical Gospel were extant and current in the second and third centuries, how is it possible to account for it, that the authors of the Peshito, or old Syriac version, made at the close of the second or beginning of the third century, should have translated the Gospel of Matthew from our canonical Greek copy; as it is certain they did? Nay, why need they have translated it

at all, inasmuch as the original itself would have been altogether intelligible among the Syrians?

2. How can it be satisfactorily accounted for, that a true Hebrew original of Matthew, so widely diffused as the *εὐαγγέλιον κατ' Ἑβραίων* was, should have been so utterly and early lost that no traces of it except a few fragments remains?

3. If our present Greek Matthew is a mere *translation*, how is it possible that no tradition of early ages should have conveyed any report to Christians, who the translator was and where he lived? I am aware, indeed, that later ecclesiastical writers, with a view to save the credit of the *Greek* Gospel of Matthew, assign to it translations of high authority. The author of the *Synopsis Sac. Script.* (printed in Opp. Athanasii, Tom. II. p. 155) says, that "it was interpreted (*ἠρμενεύθη*) by James, the brother of the Lord according to the flesh." Isidorus Hispalensis (*De Vita et Obi. Sanct. c. 76*), and Nicephorus (*IV. 32*), assert that Bartholomew *translated* it into the language of *India*, where he preached; which, however, has no bearing on our present Greek copy. Anastasius Sinaita (*Anagog. Contempl. c. 8*) avers, that Luke and Paul translated it into Greek; Theophylact (*Prooem. in Matt.*), that the apostle John translated it. All these reports, however, are so late and so discrepant as to shew, that what Jerome said at the close of the fourth century was no doubt true; viz., "*Quis in Graecum transtulerit, non satis certum est;*" *de Vir. Illustr. c. 3*. This is said in one of his *earlier* works, when he seems to have fully believed in a Hebrew original, and before he had enjoyed an opportunity of examining for himself.

4. Is it probable in any good degree, that authentic *Hebrew* copies of Matthew should have escaped the laborious and diligent search of Origen, and of Lucian in his recension of Mss., who doubtless had some acquaintance with the Syro-Chaldaic language, from the fact that he lived at Antioch in Syria?

5. The genuineness and authenticity of the canonical *Greek* Gospel of Matthew do not appear to have even been at all doubted or impugned, at least in the church catholic, in the primitive ages of Christianity. How could this happen, if it were a mere *version*, and the original was still current?

These are considerations which seem to be of serious weight, in respect to the question, What was the original language of Matthew? Many other arguments have been urged both for and against the *originality* of the Greek, from the use which is made of the Sept. version, and from the appeal which is now and then made to the Hebrew Scriptures themselves, by translating them directly and independently of this version. Even in cases where Matthew has recorded that which is peculiar to himself, and in which he differs from the other Evangelists, he translates directly from the Hebrew; e. g. 2: 6, 15, 18. 4: 15. 8: 17. 9: 13. 12: 18—21. 13: 35. 21: 4. 27: 9, 10. In other passages of the like description he follows the Sept. quite exactly; e. g. 1: 23. 21: 16. 13: 14, 15. But the same thing may be shewn also, respecting other parts of this gospel; notwithstanding Eichhorn has asserted the contrary; *Einleit. I*. After all, then, nothing that is much to be relied upon in argument, can be made out in this way. A translator of a Hebrew original of Matthew might sometimes take the Sept. version as his

guide, and sometimes translate directly for himself Matthew's quotations from the Hebrew Scriptures. Matthew might do the same, if he wrote in Greek. Nothing certain or important, then, can be made out of this argument, in respect to the *original* of Matthew's Gospel.

Does the work abound in *Hebraisms*? It does; but these can be no proof that the original was Hebrew; for the same thing is true of all parts of the New Testament, and, in my judgment, not less true of even Luke, than of Matthew.

Bolten, and after him Eichhorn and others, have endeavored to shew, that by recurring to the *διλογία* of the original, or at least to words capable of two significations in the Syro-Chaldaic, we may account for some alleged errors in our present canonical Gospel of Matthew; and therefore it follows, that the *original* of it was probably Syro-Chaldaic. But these and all such allegations are equally applicable to all other parts of the New Testament. Bolten, indeed, has so applied them. Interpreters of the present day, however, regard such a method of reasoning as both unnecessary and improbable. The alleged errors are most of them, to say the least, the errors of Bolten as to the real meaning of the text, and not the errors of the sacred writers.

In a word; how can I read the Gospel of Matthew, as it now lies before me, and feel that I am reading a *translation* made in ancient times? Where is any *version* like it? The Septuagint? That is greatly diverse from it, in very many and important respects. I can no more find *internal* evidences of a *version* in Matthew, than I can in Mark, Luke, or John. I must believe, then, that the real *original* is before us. There is no evidence of an *Aramaean* original, except what proves the Aramaean work at the same time to be spurious. Why should we then admit such an original?

NOTE 16. *SOURCES of the Gospel of Mark; also of the Gospels of Luke and Matthew.* (p. 349, § 17 seq.)

To discuss this subject at length, would require a volume; and even to give any particular account of all which has been written in relation to it, would require much more space than has been allotted to this subject by Hug, or than can be here allowed. I shall therefore confine myself to a few leading and elementary notices, which may serve in some measure to guide the researches of the reader, who may wish to go deeply into an investigation of this nature.

I. All who read and compare the three first Gospels, as they stand exhibited in any good Greek Harmony, cannot fail to notice, that they agree not only in the general tenor of narration, as to the important sayings and doings of Jesus, but often in the very *diction* itself; and in regard to the diction, in some cases the different Gospels agree even in quotations from the Old Testament, where the translation is made *de novo* and not copied from the Sept. version.

Let the reader compare, for his own satisfaction as to this, not only



the general tenor of the historical narrations, but also their agreement as to modes of expression in the following examples, viz., (1) Between all three of the Evangelists.

Matt.	3: 3.	Mark	1: 3.	Luke	3: 4.
	9: 5.		2: 20.		5: 35.
	16: 28.		10: 23.		10: 24.

(2) Between Matthew and Luke.

Matt.	4: 5.	Luke	4: 9.
	4: 18.		4: 8.
	7: 5.		6: 42.
	11: 10.		7: 27.
	11: 11.		7: 28.
	11: 26.		10: 24.
	21: 44.		20: 18.
	24: 50.		12: 46.

(3) Between Matthew and Mark.

Matt.	15: 8 seq.	Mark	7: 6 seq.
	24: 32.		13: 20.
	26: 55.		14: 48.

(4) Between Mark and Luke.

Mark	6: 41.	Luke	9: 16.
	15: 15.		22: 12.

These are, of course, only a small specimen of what might easily be produced; but they may serve as an example to illustrate what has been asserted above.

II. More striking, especially, is the resemblance of the Gospel of Mark to that of Matthew particularly, and then to that of Luke in many respects. In fact, he seems to have only about twenty-seven verses which are entirely peculiar to himself as to *matter*, although in most other cases he has more or less of difference, either as to circumstantial *things* or else as to *diction*.

(1) The verses which contain matter peculiar altogether to himself, are in 4: 26—29. 7: 32—37. 8: 22—26. 11: 11—14. 13: 33—37. 16: 9—11.

(2) Mark appears sometimes to follow Luke, and sometimes Matthew; as the reader may see by comparing the following passages; viz.,

Mark	1: 35—39.	Luke	4: 42—44.
	1: 45.		5: 15 seq.
	4: 21—25.		8: 16—18.
	6: 14—29.	Matt.	14: 1—12.

(3) Mark apparently uses the text of both Matthew and Luke in combination, as may be seen by comparing,

Mark	3: 7—12.	Luke	6: 17—19.	Matt.	12: 15—16.
	6: 30—33.		9: 10, 11.		14: 13.

Mark	8: 3.	Luke	1: 42.	Matt.	5: 13.
	8: 4.		1: 44.		5: 14.
	9: 9.		2: 3 seq.		5: 27 seq.
	9: 17.		2: 22.		5: 37.
	8: 27.		4: 41 seq.		8: 25.
	8: 28.		5: 1 seq.		8: 26.

This catalogue could be easily extended to passages almost without number, scattered through the whole Gospel of Mark. See De Wette, *Einleit. ins N. Test.* p. 139, ed. 2nd.

(4) Mark appears sometimes to make a summary of Matthew or Luke, or to give a short hint of what is contained more at large in them. E. g.

Mark	1: 12 seq.	Matt.	4: 1 seq. 11.	Luke	4: 1, 2.
	4: 34.		13: 34, 36 seq.		
	16: 12 seq.				24: 13 seq.
	16: 14 seq.		28: 16 seq.		24: 36 seq.

Phenomena of this kind have led many recent critics of high standing, to assume the position that Mark made up his Gospel principally from the work of Matthew and Luke, and that he has only here and there exhibited an *original* hand, while for the most part he is merely a close and faithful epitomator.

This idea, or one kindred to it, is not entirely new. So long ago as the beginning of the fifth century, Augustine (*de Consensu Evangel.* I. 4) said: *Marcus Matthaeum subsequutus, tanquam pedissequus et breviator ejus videtur.* This distinguished father, no doubt, came to such a view, by a diligent comparison of the two Gospels of Matthew and Mark.

In modern times many hints of the like nature have been thrown out. Grotius (*ad Matt.* i. and *Luke* i.), Mill (*Proleg.* § 169), and Wetstein (*Praef. at Marci Evang.* and *ad Luc. Evang.*), advance the supposition, that Mark in writing his Gospel made use of Matthew; and that Luke, in writing his, made use of both Matthew and Mark. Storr, on the other hand, held Mark's Gospel to be the original one, and the source of both Matthew and Luke; *Ueber den Zweck Johannis*, etc. § 58—62; also in his *De Fonte Evangeliorum*, etc., in *Commentt. Theol.* by Velthusen, Kuinoel, and Ruperti, Vol. III. Büsching maintained that Luke is the oldest writer, that he served as the basis of Matthew, and that both together were the basis of Mark; *Vorrede zur Harmonie*, p. 109. Comp. Eichh. *Allgem. Biblioth.* V. p. 489. Vogel, more recently, maintains that Luke is the source of Mark; and that both Luke and Mark are the basis of Matthew; in *Gabler's Journal für auserl. theol. Litteratur*, B. I. St. 1.

Finally, Griesbach, in a most laboured and very able essay, printed in the *Comm. Theol.* of Velthusen, etc., Vol. I., and entitled *De Fontibus*, etc., endeavoured to prove that Mark has every where copied Matthew, (as Augustine has said, *pedissequus et breviator*). This essay was first published in 1789. Owen, in his *Observations on the four Gospels*, Lond. 1764, had before hinted the same thing. Stroth (in *Eichh. Repertor.* IX. p. 144) accords with this view; as does Paulus in his *Conservatorium*, I., and Ammon in his *De Luca emendatore Matthaei*,

1805; all, however, with some peculiarities of their own. In 1825, H. Saunier published at Berlin, an essay entitled, *Ueber die Quellen des Evang. des Markus*; in which, according to general assent, he seems to have established the main position of Griesbach in respect to the Gospel of Mark, beyond all reasonable contradiction.

But while it is agreed on all hands, and indeed it is quite impossible that it should be denied, that the Gospel of Mark does in a peculiar manner resemble that of Matthew, yet there is more than one way of accounting for this resemblance. We have seen to what theory the distinguished writers just named resorted, in order to account for this resemblance between any two or all three of the Gospels. The basis of the theory is, the copying of some one or two of the Gospels by the author of another. This, however, has in its turn met with vehement opposition from a quarter that we should hardly have expected, viz., from some of the neological critics. *Russwurm* (*Ueber d. Ursprung der 3 Evangg.* 1797), *Eichhorn* (*Einleit.* I. 373 seq.), and *Bertholdt* (*Einleit.* III. p. 1127 seq.), allege, that on such a ground no good reason can be given, why each Evangelist here and there has something peculiar to himself; why he here and there speaks more definitely than another, more circumstantially, more chronologically, and sometimes more briefly and summarily. No good reason, they say, can be given, why the diction even of one should be altered by his copyist for the worse, made obscure where it was before plain, be changed without being improved, made into poorer Greek instead of better, and other things of the like nature.

On the ground that the Evangelists were *servile* copyists, these objections seem to be unanswerable. But on the ground that the Evangelists made, each in his turn, free use of the Gospels before composed, yet not so as to bind himself in all respects as to matter or manner, these objections in themselves considered would not be very weighty.

But have those who have urged such objections, substituted any better theory in the place of that which they oppose? *Hug* has answered this question, in a good measure, in §§ 18—30; where he has proposed the respective theories of *Marsh*, *Eichhorn*, and *Gratz*. The basis of all these theories it is easy to place before the mind of a reader, in a manner altogether intelligible. It may be stated in a few words.

I. There are so many and so close resemblances between the three first Evangelists, that they can be accounted for in no other way than by supposing, either that they have copied from each other, or from some common document or documents.

(2) They have not copied from each other, for the reasons just stated above.

(3) It must follow, that they have copied from some common documents.

To shew in what way all the various *discrepancies* among the Gospels, as to matter and style, may be accounted for on this last ground, different theorists have proposed plans which differ in their detail, although the basis of them all is substantially the same.

(a) The Gospel according to the Hebrews has been made the common source by some; e. g. *Lessing*, *Vermischte Schriften*, VI. 50.

Niemeyer, *Conjecturae ad Illustrandum*, etc. 1790. Weber, *Beiträge zur Geschichte des N. Test. Kanons*, 1791. *Evang. der Hebräer*, 1806.

(b) The original *Hebrew* Gospel of Matthew has been regarded as the common source of the three first canonical Gospels by others; e. g. Corrodi, *Beleucht. d. Geschicht. des Bibelkanons*, II. 150. Thiess, *Comm. in N. Test.*, Einl. § 13 seq. J. E. C. Schmidt, *Entwurf etc.*, in *Henke's Magaz.* IV. St. 3. Bolten, *Vorrede zur deutsch. Uebersetz. der Evangelien*.

(c) Eichhorn has brought forward two theories; the first of which is in his *Allgem. Biblioth. B. V.* The substance of this is, (1) A *πρωτευαγγέλιον* (*Urevangelium*). (2) An altered edition of this, which we may call *A.*; which is the basis of Matthew. (3) A still different and altered edition of No. 1, that we may name *B.*; which is the basis of Luke. (4) A new edition of No. 1, incorporating the additions and alterations in *A.* and *B.*; the basis of Mark. (5) Another edition still, different from any of the preceding, the basis of the peculiarities in Matthew and Luke where they agree with each other but differ from Mark.

Bishop Marsh, in his translation of *Michaelis*, not content with this theory, and unable to solve all the phenomena of the three first Gospels by it, invented another mode of solution still more complicated. In No. (1) We have the original Hebrew or Syro-Chaldaic Gospel. (2) The Greek translation of it. (3) Copies of this with smaller and larger additions; which we may note by *a* and *A.* (4) Still different copies, with the like additions; *β* and *B.* (5) A copy in which Nos. 3 and 4 are mingled together; the basis of Mark. (6) Matthew has for its basis No. 3, with some new additions in still different recensions of No. 1, which may be named *γ* and *I' 1.* (7) Luke has for its basis a new edition of No. 4, which has also incorporated in it the additions *γ* and *I' 1.* (8) Matthew and Luke made use of still another original Gospel, *נ*, which contained additions *I' 2*; and this accounts for their agreement with each other, in some cases where they both differ from Mark.

Eichhorn, moved it would seem by the difficulties which Marsh had suggested, or else coveting something still more ingenious and artificial than his first theory, came out anew in his *Einleit. ins N. Test. I.*, with a more complex theory still. (1) An Aramaean original Gospel. (2) A Greek translation of it. (3) Original Gospel remodeled, *A.*; the basis of Matthew. (4) Greek translation of this, modified by No. 2. (5) A different modeling of No. 1 in the Aramaean, *B.*; the basis of Luke. (6) An edition in which Nos. 3 and 5 were united, *C.*; the basis of Mark. (7) A fourth remodeling of the original Gospel, different from all the others, *D.*; used by Matthew and Luke, where they agree together and differ from Mark. (8) A Greek version of this on the basis of No. 2. (9) Matthew's *Hebrew* Gospel, as a whole, is derived from Nos. 3 and 7, i. e. *A.* and *D.*, and may be called *E.* (10) Matthew's *Greek* Gospel is derived from Nos. 4 and 8, i. e. the altered Greek versions of *A.* and *D.* (11) Mark in using *A.* and *B.*, Nos. 3 and 5, used the Greek version of *A.*, and the original Aramaean of *B.* (12) Luke not only used *B.* and *D.*, Nos. 5 and 7, but also a still different recension of the original Gospel, named *F.* Moreover he used the Greek version of *D.*, but the original Aramaean of *B.*



Did the reader ever see, or imagine, any thing like to this, in order to account for the composition of a brief, simple, historical narration? Yet Ziegler, Haenlein, Kuinoel, Bertholdt, Gratz, and many others, have declared in favour of a *πρωτευαγγέλιον*, and have endeavoured, although with variations from Marsh and Eichhorn as to some particulars of their theory, to account for the sameness and the discrepancies of the Evangelists in this strained and unnatural manner.

It is enough to say, that not a trace exists in all antiquity of this famous *πρωτευαγγέλιον*, (which it is hardly possible to account for, had there been any such document); that the theories in question would reduce the Evangelists to mere second hand, drudging plagiarists, who were not able to write scarcely a sentence of their own which was original; that it will not, after all, account for many of the resemblances or discrepancies in question; and that the whole thing is so artificial, so strained, and so derogatory to the character of the Evangelists, that, in case it were matter of fact, we can conceive of no good reason why our *canonical* Gospels came into general circulation among the ancients, in preference to the originals from which they were plagiarized. Popular and captivating as these theories were among the Germans, when first broached, they have now become nearly as extinct in Germany as Hardouin's theory of the authorship of the classics, which attributed them to the monks of the middle ages. In looking seriously at them, now, one is forced to exclaim: When will the extravagant vagaries of the human mind cease to mislead? De Wette himself, who is far from being averse to singular theories in criticism, exclaims: "One can only *wonder*, that these hypotheses should have ever gained approbation." Yet Kuinoel's Commentary, down to the present hour, is filled with references to the *πρωτευαγγέλιον*, as though it were altogether a matter plain and well established!

The theory of Dr. Gieseler, examined by Hug in § 22 (p. 364), is less revolting than those already presented, but on the whole not more satisfactory. A *stereotyped* traditional Gospel, such as he supposes, is practically an impossibility. Every narrator in prose would alter the costume more or less to suit his own style. In *substance* the story might remain the same; but it would receive many additions and changes. Dr. G., however, was not original in this thought. Eckermann (Theol. Beiträge, B. II.), Herder (Von Gottes Sohn), Kaiser (Bibl. Theol. I. 224), Paulus (Allgem. Lit. Zeit. 1813), and others, have broached the same views. But Dr. G. has adorned them with a more attractive dress.

The common sense and sober reflection of some other critics have brought them, at last, to the simple basis on which as it seems to me this whole matter should always have been placed, and where Luke has opened a way plainly for us to place it, in the proem to his Gospel. Let us for a moment attentively examine this.

Ἐπειδήπερ πολλοὶ ἐπεχείρησαν ἀνατάξασθαι διήγησιν περὶ τῶν πεπληροφορημένων ἐν ἡμῖν πραγμάτων, καθὼς παρέδοσαν ἡμῖν οἱ ἀπ' ἀρχῆς αὐτόπται καὶ ὑπηρέται γενόμενοι τοῦ λόγου· ἔδοξε καμοὶ παρακολουθηκότι ἀνωθεν πάντιν ἀκριβῶς, καθ' ἑξῆς σοι γράψαι, κρᾷτιστε Θεόφιλε· ἵνα ἐπιγινῶς περὶ ὧν κατηχήθης λόγων τὴν ἀσφάλειαν.

Let us see, then, what are the views which are here distinctly given. (1) *Many* have undertaken to compose narrations, (and in *writing* too, for so ἀνατάξασθαι διήγησιν must here mean, else it will be no apology for Luke's *writing* a διήγησις), respecting the sayings and doings of Christ. (2) Eye witnesses and *ministers of the word*, (this is the usual sense of ὑπηρέται τοῦ λόγου, and no other is critically and exegetically certain), had spread abroad *oral* accounts of the same matters. So παρέδωσαν naturally means; and so it should be construed here. To suppose an ellipsis of διήγησιν after παρέδωσαν here (as Hug does p. 388), seems to me not only to be forced and unnatural, but to miss the evident aim of the writer. The καὶ οὕτως here I do not refer back to ἀνατάξασθαι διήγησιν, and thus make the writer say, that the *many* had undertaken to compose narrations which would accord with the testimony of eye and ear witnesses; but I refer it, as the laws of grammar would naturally direct us to do, to the clause immediately preceding. The writer means to say, that the events narrated in evangelical histories did in reality happen (πεπληροφορημένων), and that we have the testimony of eye and ear witnesses as vouchers for the fact that they did.

Thus far then the *protasis* of the sentence. In this we have the simple declarations, that many had undertaken to compose *written* narrations respecting the sayings and doings of Jesus, which were orally testified to by eye and ear witnesses. The question, whether *the many* had succeeded well or ill in composing their narrations, the writer does not here solve. The fact that they professed and meant to follow the testimony of eye and ear witnesses, may well be supposed; for nothing was more natural than for the writers of such narrations to make their appeal to such sources. But that they succeeded well in accomplishing the work which they undertook,—of that we are not here informed, but left merely to conjecture, or at most to draw a probable inference from the sequel of the sentence.

What now, in view of the facts just stated, does Luke himself intend to do? Apologizing as it were for his undertaking, because many others had already engaged in the like work; declaring that he had traced every thing up to its source (παρηκολούθησεν ἄνωθεν πᾶσιν ἀκριβῶς), he intends to write to Theophilus καθεξῆς, in order, i. e. with arrangement and proper construction. Here is probably a covert intimation, that the πολλοί had not done so. If they had, what need of a new διήγησις? we might naturally ask. Yet the personal friendship of Luke for Theophilus, and probably the desire of the latter to have such a work from his hand, might have moved him to this, even in case the other διηγήσεις had not been specially deficient as to matter or manner.

There is yet one or two more circumstances to be noted. They are these, viz. that Luke made such inquiries as he specifies, and came to a resolution to write καθεξῆς, in order that Theophilus might know the certainty (ἀσφάλειαν) of the matters in which he had been orally instructed (κατηχήθη). Here is an implication that the writings of the πολλοί would not effectually secure this end; or at least, that Luke hoped himself more effectually to secure it. There is another intimation, very important to our present purpose, viz., that Theophilus had been orally taught the matter of the gospels already, περὶ ὧν κατηχήθη λόγων. Here then we have a most explicit intimation of the manner in which the Gospel was originally propagated. There were many

*writings* in circulation. But the eye and ear witnesses continued to tell the story *orally* (παρέδοσαν). It was thus that it had been propagated to Theophilus, who either had no written διηγήσεις, or did not care to use those which he had seen. Luke therefore undertook to give him a more permanent, stable, and exact account than he had hitherto received; although that in which he had been *orally* instructed, does not seem to be regarded as discordant with the testimony of eye and ear witnesses.

Thus we have the state of the Christian world before us, when Luke wrote; which could not be much remote from the time in which the other Evangelists also wrote. Original witnesses were every where "spreading abroad the word," and πολλοί were endeavouring to help on the same cause, by composing narrations in writing. But these productions, however well meant, do not seem in the judgment of Luke to be worthy of all acceptance and confidence; and therefore he comes to the conclusion in his mind, that some new efforts are needed as to *written* communications of the Gospel.

From this state of things, so obvious and so natural, it seems to me that we may account for all that needs to be accounted for, both as to the *resemblances* and *discrepancies* of the three first Gospels.

I cannot for a moment accede, however, to the criticism of Hug upon παρακολουθηκότι (p. 391), by which he makes it here to mean, that Luke 'was in the region where he could observe all the events that he relates, as they took place,' and this from their first development. There can, indeed, be no doubt that παρακολουθέω, in its first and *literal* sense, means to be personally present with any individual or at the occurrence of any particular event. But in the case before us, this literal meaning is out of all question, in consequence of the ἀκριβῶς with which παρακολουθέω is joined, and which shews very plainly that only a *mental* παρακολουθέω can be intended, i. e. an accurate and diligent tracing of things to their original sources, a careful scrutiny of them. I am aware that Hug (p. 394) reckons Luke among the *seventy* disciples sent out by the Saviour to preach the Gospel; according to the tradition mentioned by Origen (Dial. cont. Marcion., Tom. I. p. 806, ed. De la Rue), and also by Epiphanius (Adv. Haeres. XXXI. or LI. § 12). But Col. 4: 11—15 seems to shew that Luke was not ἐκ περικομῆς, and therefore that he was a *Gentile proselyte*. He appears first on the scene of Christian action, in Acts 16: 11, where he is related to have joined himself to Paul and gone with him to Philippi. Is it probable that at this time he could have engaged in such journeyings and services as he afterwards performed, provided he had been so far advanced in life as he must now have been, in case he was one of the seventy disciples?

Luke, then, according to these suggestions, must have gone to Palestine, the scene of evangelical action, and there learned and treasured up the things which he has produced to our view in his Gospel. So he would seem to say in his Prooem; at least he says the most important part of this, viz., that he had made diligent scrutiny of every thing ἄνωθεν, i. e. even to its very sources. This he could not have done, without repairing in person to Palestine. Tradition says that he was born at Antioch; Euseb. Hist. Ecc. III. 4. Jerome, De Viris Illust., v. Lucas. There the Gospel was *early* preached; and there he may have been, and probably was, an early convert to it.



Let us see now in the case of Luke, which at present is before us and will serve equally well for that of Matthew and Mark, what were the means or materials for writing accessible to this Evangelist. (1) There was the testimony of eye and ear witnesses, scattered all over the country of Palestine, both as to the words and deeds of Jesus. (2) There were the written documents of *many*; which, although not in all respects as they should have been, no doubt exhibited much that was true and useful. Did he make use of these sources only, or was there before him the Gospel of Matthew; not to say (as Hug supposes) that of Mark also?

It seems to be implied in the proem of Luke, that the πολλοί there named as authors of evangelical διηγήσεις, had not written καθεξῆς nor ἀκριβῶς, nor investigated ἀνωθεν. Could he, and would he have said this of the two apostles, Matthew and John? Were their Gospels among the works of the πολλοί which are thus characterized? To me it seems plain that they were not. Does not Matthew commence his work ἀνωθεν? Does not John go even further back still, and commence with the *Logos* state itself of existence? Would the intimate friend of Paul, and the hearty friend of the Christian cause, have thus spoken of Matthew and John?

Then if Luke copied from the Gospels of Matthew and Mark, how could he have omitted so many important things which they contain? Examine, for example, Matthew 9: 27 seq. 13: 24 seq. 14: 22 seq. 15: 21 seq., 32 seq. 16: 1—12. 17: 24 seq. 19: 1—12. 22: 34 seq. 25: 1—13, 31—46. 26: 6 seq. 27: 28 seq.

Examine also Mark 1: 16 seq. 6: 45 seq. vii. 8: 1—26. 10: 1—10. 12: 28 seq. 14: 3 seq. 15: 17 seq.

All these important matters recorded here, Luke has wholly omitted. That he differs from Matthew specially, and sometimes from Mark, in the order of his narrations, lies upon the face of every Greek Harmony. That he is in many cases less circumstantial, minute, and exact, as to designating place, etc., every one must know, who minutely examines the evangelical histories. See an exhibition of striking examples, in Schott's Isagoge, p. 40, Note 5.

In substance the like things may be said of Mark's Gospel. If he was, as Griesbach and others have strenuously asserted, the mere *epitomator* of Matthew, or of Matthew and Luke, how comes it that there is not a word of the proem of either of these two Gospels in that of Mark? Why did he not tell us any thing of the Sermon on the Mount? Why has he, in a multitude of places, made circumstantial additions to the narrative, which are wanting in Matthew, or in Luke, or in both? Why does he *Hebraize* more thoroughly than either, and abound more in *anacolutha* and peculiarities of construction? Why has he so many favourite phrases and modes of expression, which seldom or never appear elsewhere? J. D. Schulze (in Keil and Tzschirner's *Analekten*, B. II. III.) has pointed out more than 80 words, in the short historical composition of Mark, which he has employed in a sense or connection entirely peculiar to himself, or nearly so. The same author reckons more than 76 ἀπαξ λεγόμενα in the same Evangelist. Can all this be true of a composition of so little extent, and yet Mark be a mere *epitomator* or *pedisequus*? Can all this be true (that it is, will not be denied), and yet Mark be a mere plagiarist, a copyist who is a very drudge,



and knows little more than to transcribe, or at most abridge, what he finds in his exemplar?

In substance the same thing may be said of Matthew. What other Evangelist exhibits the matter of this prooem; a great part of the Sermon on the Mount; and many particulars in various parts of his narration? Has he not a *τάξις*, or rather an *ἀταξία*, which is altogether his own, and from which all the other Evangelists have departed? Does he not quote the Old Testament Scriptures more than all the other Evangelists collectively? Does any other Evangelist make such use of transition-phrases as he; viz. such as *καὶ ἐγένετο, ὅτε ἐτέλεσεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς, ἐν ἐκείνῳ τῷ καιρῷ, ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις ἐκείναις*, and especially *τότε*? Has he not, like Mark, a large number of words and phrases, which are employed by him in a sense altogether peculiar to himself; and a still larger number of *ἀπαξ λεγόμενα*? See Schott, *Isagoge*, p. 83. Notes 3, 4, comp. id. p. 28, Note 4.

Let now an unprejudiced and skilful reader, who is wedded to no system or theory in respect to the *γένεσις* of the Gospels, take up a Greek Harmony, and read on with the most minute and scrutinizing attention to diction, grammatical construction, transition-particles and phrases, variation of order, place, circumstances, particularity, omissions by one and insertions by another, fulness in one and brevity in another, and the like; all of which applies respectively in a greater or less degree to each Evangelist; let him read through the Gospels in this way, and he will need no critic to tell him, whether the writers of the first three Gospels were men who stood upon their own basis, or whether they were men who merely reared up a building with materials already collected and prepared by others. No critic, by any or all of his analyses and comparisons, will satisfy him that these historians are not after all independent writers.

But, to notice the last question and the turning point of the whole: 'How is it possible that there should be so much *sameness* between any two, or all three, of them? Can this be the result of any thing but of *copying* from each other, or from some sources which they all used in common?'

I have no hesitation in saying, that it seems quite possible to me to account for all the *sameness* which they exhibit, without resorting to either of these suppositions. For all the *diversity* which they exhibit, we need not account, on the supposition that they were independent writers, for then it is manifest of itself; but on the ground that they were mere copyists and plagiarists, this *diversity* would itself become as difficult a problem, as any which *sameness* among them now presents.

Who has not heard of the *ῥαψωδοί* of ancient days? How were Homer's and Hesiod's poems preserved, for centuries after they were written? Every school-boy knows the answer to this question. Every one, too, who has read the Arabian Night's Entertainment, and is acquainted with the present customs of the East, knows full well, that there are a multitude of wandering *ῥαψωδοί* there, who could repeat more than the thousand and one stories, and who transmit their tales in succession from one generation to another. This custom of repeating romantic stories and pieces of poetry, occupies a place in the East like to that of the drama in the West, and excites even a greater interest.

How was it in Palestine, as to matters of this nature? There, for some ages, the *traditions* of the elders had been *orally* handed down. So they continued to be, for more than two centuries after the Christian era commenced. At length Rabbi Judah Hakkodesh reduced them to writing, and embodied them in the *Mishna*. The very prooem of *Pirge Aboth* sets out with the declaration, that the traditions which it contains, came down from Moses and the seventy elders of his time. And although we give no credit to this extravagant claim, yet so much lies on the face of Jewish history as exhibited in the Gospels, viz. that they had a multitude of *traditions* handed down from former times, which were orally preserved.

Who has not read of the Scalds, or *ῥαψωδοί* of northern Europe? Who does not know that among the aborigines of our country, and among nearly all nations destitute of literature, traditional sayings and stories and poetry are orally preserved?

Of the many thousands, then, who heard Jesus speak, and who witnessed his miracles, were there not many alive at the period when our Gospels were written? Surely there were. But as to Matthew, he himself being an original eye and ear witness, why need we go to any other source than his own recollection or his own *memoranda*? Could not a *publican* write? And could he not of course write Greek, if he had sustained such an office as this?

As to Mark; it is admitted, on all hands, that he was the intimate friend and companion of Peter. Was not Peter an original and authentic source of consultation for him? Would not the recollection of Peter and of Matthew be very likely to *agree* somewhat as to diction, in very many cases where there was something peculiar and striking; and yet these two apostles might *differ* as to diction, when they came to narrate less striking events or sayings? Nothing is more natural than all this; and therefore nothing more probable.

As to *Luke*, he tells us that he investigated every thing *ἄνωθεν*. Of course he must have resorted to *apostolic* testimony. None but apostles could have given testimony in many cases such as he exhibits. Now to whatever apostle he betook himself for information, there would be the same ground of similitude or of discrepancy in respect to others, as in the case of Matthew and Peter. Striking and peculiar things would be said in the same words, or very nearly so; other matters would leave room for a greater variety, and for personal peculiarities of diction.

In this way, it seems to me, we may very naturally account for it, how the Evangelists came to agree, and also how they came to differ so often and so much as they do. Above all, the traits of each individual writer, whatever his sources of information were, would occasion, as indeed it actually has occasioned, a great variety oftentimes in phraseology and *usus loquendi*.

As to the Gospel of John, we need resort to no other *human* sources but to those of his own mind and memory. His diction, and every thing else, is confessedly his own, and is *sui generis*.

If any choose to say, that besides the sources thus pointed out, the Evangelists also resorted to the *δηγήσεις* of the *many*, to whom Luke refers; this is altogether a possible and supposable case, but, considering the character of these *δηγήσεις*, not altogether probable. Why

should the Evangelists take up with *inferior* sources of information, when *superior* ones were within their reach?

I cannot conclude this long note upon an almost endlessly disputed subject, without subjoining a single remark more. This is, that nearly all the writers who have made out theories about the origin of the three first Gospels, seem to have left out of sight any consideration of the *inspiration* of the authors. In this I cheerfully and unreservedly profess my belief; but the arguments in favor of it do not belong to this place. Inspiration does not, indeed, set aside at all the characteristic style of different writers; nor does it exclude efforts on their part to investigate, as we see in the case of Luke 1: 1—4; but it will, of course, wherever it exists, modify in a greater or less degree any writing with which it is concerned. Why should it be so wholly overlooked by the critical theorists, who write upon the *γένεσις* of the Gospels?

NOTE 17. *Gospel of Luke.* (§§ 33—48, p. 387 seq.)

Most of what Hug says, is concerned with the analysis of Luke's Gospel, and is designed to shew how we may conceive of his having *succeeded* Matthew and Mark, and made use of both their Gospels. As I understand Luke's proem, this supposition is quite inadmissible. Hug has taken great pains with his analysis and with his comparison of Luke with Matthew and Mark, and shewn not a little acuteness as to a choice of means to make out the propositions at which he is aiming. But as I entertain radical doubts of the correctness of his results, and this for the reasons above stated, I need not dwell on what he has said at so much length. In my apprehension, it would be quite as easy to make out *different* results by a like process of analysis and comparison; and when all was thus done, should we be any nearer to ground that would support us? Let the never ending variations of *genetic* theories answer this question.

NOTE 18. *Gospel of John.* (§ 49 seq. p. 420 seq.)

The analysis of Hug in §§ 49—57, and the proof which he deduces from the result of them as to the *later* composition of John's Gospel, may satisfy the minds of those who place dependence on this kind of reasoning for the establishment of such conclusions. That there are statements in the Gospel of John which suppose the readers to be acquainted with the facts related in the other Gospels, will not be denied. But whether the knowledge thus supposed came *orally* to the readers, like that of Theophilus to him; or whether it was derived from *written* Gospels; who can decide?

Nothing is plainer, than that John has a *doctrinal* object particularly

in view. Many things that he says, certainly have more emphasis, when we suppose them to have been said *antithetically*, i. e. against the Gnostics, the Cerinthians, the Zabians, and others. But no *terra firma* can well be won here. The question, whether his design was *polem-ic*, is still involved in more uncertainty than Hug seems to suppose or to admit.

The most considerable opponent to the *genuineness* of the Gospel of John, is Bretschneider, in his *Probabilia de Evangelii et Epistolarum Johannis Indole* etc., 1820. Hug has passed in review most of his main positions, in § 58 seq. The Alogi in ancient times denied the authority of this Gospel. Evanson, Vogel, Horst, Ballenstedt, Cludius, and some others of less note, have also denied it within the last forty years. The main reasons assigned are, (1) 'That John, a fisherman of Galilee, could not have had the knowledge which was necessary in order to write his Gospel in such a manner as it is written.'

The answer to this is, the facts as detailed in § 10, p. 342 of Hug. A fisherman on the Lake of Tiberias would be very likely to know the Greek language, because of the great variety of persons assembled at such places for business and trade; and he would almost of course be necessitated to understand it, in order to carry on his business. Besides, the employment was by no means an ignoble one among the Jews; nor is there any thing which shews, or even renders it probable, that the parents of John, or that he himself, was in very indigent circumstances. Above all; if we suppose John to have written late in life, after he had been many years at Ephesus, what difficulty can be made as to his knowledge of Greek?

(2) 'The Gospel of John, in its proem, philosophizes too deeply about the Logos, for a fisherman of the Lake.'

The answer to this would be, that the conclusion which represents him as *philosophizing* at all, results from erroneous and constructive interpretation. To me John seems to have taken simple and radical ground, which upsets indeed all the Logos philosophy of the Greeks, or the emanation-philosophy of the East, but which still has little if any designed *antithetic* reference to either of these.

(3) 'There are many self contradictions in this Gospel.'

So indeed there are, if such exegesis is to be admitted as makes out the declarations of John to be *contradictions*. The contradiction, however, is shewn to be between such exegesises and the laws of hermeneutics or ground principles of philology.

(4) 'This Gospel exhibits errors as to history, antiquities, and geography.'

Recent commentaries, such as those of Kuinoel, Lücke, and Tholuck, have shewn how little foundation there is for such an objection; but especially the works of defence, which will be mentioned in the sequel, have still more effectually done this.

In regard to the alleged "irreconcilable difference" between John and the other Evangelists, as to the account of the time when Jesus with his disciples last celebrated the passover, Hug has done what could be done, while one limits himself merely to *external* history, and does not investigate the proper idiom of the Scriptures. The solution which he offers, however, seems altogether improbable, as it appears to my



mind. I find nothing which vouches for it in any good degree, that there was any difference among the Jews, as to the time when the pass-over itself was to be actually celebrated; nothing in the evangelical accounts of the last supper, which goes to shew at all that an *unusual* season was chosen for it; nothing in the Jewish views of this ordinance which would render such an occurrence at all probable. Some may have commenced their *holy time* earlier than others; although the testimony cited by Hug from the Mishna and Gemara would serve but little purpose to establish this in respect to the time of the Saviour; but this would not render certain the proposition, that they therefore actually celebrated the passover itself before the usual time.

J. H. Rauch (translated and published in the Bib. Repos. Vol. IV. No. 13. Art. V.) has taken wholly a different course from Hug, and one altogether built upon the *usus loquendi* of the sacred writings; and he has shewn in this way, what had not before been so effectually shewn, that there is a substantial harmony among all the Evangelists in relation to this matter. To him I would earnestly refer the reader. Questions of this kind are not the element in which Hug appears to move with the most dexterity or success.

As to what Hug says on p. 446, in order to defend John's interpretation of שִׁלְחָא (*Silwāa*) by ἀπεσταλμένος, it will afford little or no satisfaction, I think, to the intelligent philological reader; for the amount of it is, that John gives to the name *Silwāa* a *mystic* interpretation. This is solving one difficulty by introducing another still greater. Besides, it betrays a want of Hebrew etymological knowledge in the writer. The Hebrew שִׁלַּח comes from שָׁלַח, *to send, send out, emit*, etc. The form שִׁלַּח may be resolved in two ways; viz., it may be regarded either as a noun like בִּידוּר, *disquietude*; בִּידוּד, *sparks*; בִּישוּר, *distaff*; קִישוּר, *smoke*; or else as a noun presenting a *forma dagessata* which is resolved by omitting the Dagesh and inserting a Yodh, like קִישוּר and קִישוּר. Nouns of this last form, i. e. of the *forma dagessata*, are שָׂכוּר, *a drunkard*; נָטוּס, *natus*; אֶחָד, *hostiliter tractatus*. In conformity with these last forms, שִׁלַּח may mean ἀπεσταλμένος as John has rendered it; or if any one prefers the first solution, it is merely the abstract (*emissio*) put for the concrete, i. e. for *emissus*, ἀπεσταλμένος; an occurrence too frequent in Hebrew to create any wonder or doubt, among those who are not disposed to doubt for reasons other than philological.

(5) 'The delineation of the person, character, and doctrines of the Saviour by the Gospel of John, differs from that in any other of the canonical Gospels.'

The answer to this is, that the style and manner of John are unquestionably different from those of the other Evangelists. The special object of his Gospel, which is a *doctrinal* one, would also of course be the occasion of some diversity in his narration. The fact that he has almost entirely omitted any thing done by Jesus, except what was done at Jerusalem and in its near neighborhood, makes a wide difference between John and his fellow-writers. They confine themselves mainly to what was done in Galilee. John has little of mere history of *facts*, almost all his Gospel being made up of the *discourses* of Jesus; while this is just the reverse in the other Evangelists.

But how can we make any thing more out of this, than that each writer had his own particular design and stand-point, and that he pursued his own particular object? Has not Matthew, Mark, Luke, each their peculiarities? Each matter appropriate to himself only? This must be allowed. All then that can be said of John is, that his Gospel is peculiarly *sui generis*. This lies indeed upon the very face of his plan and style. But to deduce from this the conclusion, that he describes a different Messiah and other doctrines than what are found in the Gospels of his coadjutors, is assuming a conclusion much broader than the premises will support.

It would be easy to shew, that all the main points of the Messiah's character, doctrines, and sufferings, are the same in all the Gospels of our Canon. This has been done; but my limits forbid me even to attempt a synopsis of the considerations which have been proffered, in order to satisfy the minds of inquirers and doubters in respect to this point. I can only refer the reader to Heydenreich, *Über die Behauptung dass Jesus in den drei synoptischen Evangelien ganz anders erscheine als in dem Johanneischen*, in Heydenreich and Hüffell's *Zeitschrift für Predigerwissenschaften*, B. I. heft 1, 2. 1827. Also Retberg, *An Johannes in exhibenda Jesu natura reliq. canon. Scriptis vere repugnet*, 1826; Borger, *De constanti et aequabili Jesu Christi Indole*, etc. 1816; Möller, *Comm. de Genii ac Indolis Evangelii Johannis prior. Evang. diversa*, etc. 1816; Reinecke, *De Constanti etc. J. C. Indole, Ingenio, Doctrina, et docendi Ratione*, etc. 1827. Schott's *Isagoge* § 38, especially Note 4 under this, where a summary may be found, made with much ability, of the leading points in respect to the subject under consideration.

In regard to Bretschneider's *Probabilia*, in which he has expressed all the doubts of former or latter times with respect to the genuineness of the Gospel of John, it might be sufficient to say, that the author has himself publicly and ingenuously retracted them, and declared that his object in publishing such a book was, to elicit more able defences of the Gospel in question than had hitherto been made. Whether this latter circumstance be altogether as candid an avowal as that of his retraction, might be questioned by some who know the love of paradox and of appearing before the public eye in a new and strange dress, which is so predominant among not a small class of the German literati. But be this as it may, Bretschneider's book has called forth a number of learned and able essays, in opposition to his doubts. A few of them, which are particularly distinguished, should be here named. Crome, *Probabilia haud probabilia*, an Essay which obtained the prize at Leipsic in 1824. Hensen, *Die Echtheit der Schriften des Evang. Johannis*, 1823. Usteri, *Comm. critica, in qua Evangelium Johannis genuinum esse*, etc., 1823. Also Olshausen, in his *Echtheit der vier canon. Evangelien*, p. 246 seq.

For the *historical* evidence, derived from the testimony of the ancient fathers, Lardner, Schmidt, Less, and almost all the introductions to the New Testament, specially Schott's *Isagoge*, § 37, Note 5, will afford a sufficient *Conspectus*. The reader may consult a fuller exhibition, in Calmberg, *Diss. theolog. de antiquissimis Patrum Testimonis*, etc. 1822. In Lampe's *Comm.*, in those of Lücke, Tholuck, and oth-

ers, summaries of this evidence may also be found. The question, as I am disposed to believe, is now finally put to rest, except among that class of writers who are excited to assail positions from the very fact that they are generally regarded as unassailable.

NOTE 19. *Object and Plan of John's Gospel.* (§ 53, p. 425 seq.)

The copious and laboured analysis of John's Gospel, in this and the ten following sections, and the comparison of it with other Gospels, although not wanting in the display of acuteness and ingenuity, do not afford any solid conviction or satisfaction to my own mind, in respect to the main positions which the writer is labouring to establish, viz., that John had seen and made use of the other Gospels, and intended his own to be rather a kind of *supplement* to them, than a work complete in itself.

John was himself an original witness. He needed no aid from foreign sources, in order to write his Gospel. And although Eusebius, Jerome, Theodoret, Epiphanius, and others of the ancient church, and Michaelis, Storr, Schulze, Hug, and many others in modern times, have asserted or defended the *supplementary* character of John's Gospel, yet there are several reasons why we may doubt of this.

(1) John has not only repeated a considerable number of things contained in the other Gospels, but almost in the same words. Let the reader compare, now,

John 2: 16.	Luke 19: 46.	Mark 11: 17.	Matt. 21: 13.
3: 35. )			
5: 20. )			
8: 19. )	10: 22.		11: 27.
10: 15. )			
4: 35.			9: 37 seq.
4: 44.			13: 57.
12: 7, 8.			26: 11, 12.
12: 25.			16: 25, 10, 39.
13: 20.	10: 16.		10: 40.
14: 13.			18: 19 seq.
17: 2.			28: 18 seq.

(2) Even longer narrations in the other Gospels are contained almost entire in that of John. E. g. John 2: 14—16. 6: 1—21. 12: 1—19. Finally, most things in the history of the crucifixion, etc.

(3) That John has omitted many things contained in the other Gospels, is obvious at first sight, and this would indeed be the case on the ground that his Gospel is *supplementary*.

(4) The traits of discrepancy as to manner and circumstances between John and the other Evangelists, where they speak of the same thing, are very numerous. One circumstance, moreover, in regard to the general tenor of John's Gospel, is very striking. John has a regular account of all the visits of Jesus to Jerusalem, after his minis-

try had commenced ; and the other Evangelists contain nothing of this kind excepting the journey just before the crucifixion, by which we could definitely ascertain whether the public life of Jesus was one or many years.

(5) If John designed his Gospel merely as a *supplement* to the others, and for the purpose of illustrating what was left undefined or somewhat obscure in them, how comes it that he has left so many of those things wholly untouched ?

(6) Finally, John has himself told us the object of his Gospel, near the close of it, viz., to shew that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God, in order that men might believe on him and be saved. He has no where hinted at any design on his part to supply the defects of others, or to appear as in aid of them, or even as the coadjutor. How could it well be, that he should no where have developed any hint of this nature, if the theory of Hug is well founded ?

Hug seems much to rely on this consideration, viz., that ' John has omitted the *more important* arguments and facts in favor of his position, relying upon it that his readers were in possession of the other Gospels.' So Prof. Hug may judge. John, we may suppose however, formed a different opinion. He tells us that the sayings and doings of Jesus were so numerous, that ' the world would not contain the books which must be written, in case they were all reported.' Of course he made, and he intended to make, only a small selection. Why now should we suppose he would omit those things that he deemed most important to his specific purpose ? I trust he did not ; and therefore that he and Prof. Hug differ in their judgment in relation to this matter.

I have already remarked, in passing, that the question whether John had a *polemic* design in view, when he wrote his Gospel, is not so plain and certain as Hug in various places (§§ 51, 52, alibi) seems to consider it. (1) Many critics suppose that a sect sprung from John the Baptist, who held him to be the promised Messiah. Traces of such a sect they find in Luke 3: 15. Acts 13: 25. 18: 25. 19: 1—5. For proof that John has reference to them in his Gospel, they appeal to John 1: 7, 8, 15, 19—34, 36. 3: 26 seq. 5: 33 seq. 10: 41, etc. So Overbeck, *Neue Versuche ueber das Evangelium Johannis*, 1784. Storr, *Ueber den Zweck der evang. Geschichte*, etc. Ziegler, *Bemerkungen ueber das Evangelium Johannis*, in Gabler's *neuest. theol. Journal*, B. 9. St. 1. Michaelis in his *Introduction to the New Testament* ; Hug as in the text ; and many others. But Paulus, *Cap. Select. Introduct. ad N. Test.* p. 153 ; Eichhorn in his *Einleit. in das N. Test.* ; Tittmann in his *Meletemata Sacra* ; Kuinoel, in his *Commentary* ; and others, have denied that the Gospel of John has any such designed bearing upon the disciples of John, as Storr and others maintain.

(2) In like manner many have supposed that John intended, in a particular manner, to oppose *Cerinthus*, who was contemporary with him, and seems to have denied that the Saviour possessed any thing more than a nature merely human. So Storr, Michaelis, and Hug, as cited above ; and so Semler in his *Paraphrasis in Evang. Johann.* ; Wegscheider in his *Versuch einer volständ. Einleitung in das Evang. Johann.* 1806 ; Kaiser in his *Comment. de apologeticis Evang. Johan. consiliis*, etc. ; and also others. To these are opposed, Lampe, *Comm. in*



Johan. I. p. 172 seq.; Tittmann, Paulus, Eichhorn, Kuinoel, as quoted above; Lücke, Comm. in Johan. I. p. 227 seq., and others.

It appears from Irenaeus, Tertullian, Epiphanius, Eusebius, and Theodoret, that Cerinthus taught that a celestial spirit (*αἰὼν*) descended upon Jesus at his baptism, and left him before his crucifixion; and that this spirit was not the *Μόνογενής* or the *Λόγος*, but one of *subordinate* rank, who dwelt in Jesus, and enabled him to perform his miracles. To these views John 1: 3, 18. 17: 1—5. 14: 9 etc., and especially 1 John 2: 22, seem to be peculiarly opposed.

(3) The *Nicolaitans* are mentioned by Irenaeus (advers. Hæres. III. 11), as opposed by John. But whether this is only a tropical name or appellative, given to certain false teachers in the early church, who maintained the lawfulness of eating flesh offered to idols and of venereal indulgencies; or whether it is a proper name derived from Nicholas or Nicholaus some unknown author of this heresy; is a question the answer to which is not yet made out. See Nov. Test. Kopp. Tom. X. p. 146. Ewald, Comm. in Apoc. Eichhorn, Comm. in Apoc. (on Rev. 2: 15). Comp. Schott's *Isagoge*, § 40, Note 7.

(4) The *Docetae* are also included by some, among those whom John opposed in his writings. So Semler in his Paraphrasis; Eckermann in his Erklärung aller dunkeln Stellen des N. Test. II. p. 5. seq.; Bertholdt, Einleit. III. p. 1818; Schmidt, Bibliothek für biblische Kritik, I. p. 73. But this is not admitted by Hug; and Kuinoel and Kaiser (as quoted above), and De Wette in his Einleit., deny this. To me there seem to be passages in the writings of John, which can hardly be accounted for on any other ground than that of *intended* opposition to an opinion like that of the Docetae; e. g. 1 John 1: 1, 2. 4: 2 seq. 2 John v. 7. John 1: 14. Comp. 19: 34. 20: 20, 27. See Schott, § 40, Note 8.

The most probable result of an investigation respecting these particular designs attributed to John in his Gospel, seems to me to be, that while it cannot well be denied that there were Zabians, Cerinthians, Nicolaitans (either in a general or a particular sense), and Docetae, in the time of John; and that all these sects (with Gnosticism yet imperfectly developed) existed in Asia Minor, and probably in and around Ephesus; yet a design *properly* and *specifically* polemic, can hardly be attributed to John; certainly not in his Gospel. I cannot doubt, for he has told us, that his principal aim was *to shew that Jesus was the Son of God and the true Messiah*. Nor can I doubt, therefore, that whatever sect was then and there in opposition to this truth, or taught what was at variance with it, when and where John first wrote his Gospel, this sect was *virtually* opposed by his Gospel. There is much emphasis and force given to several passages in his writings, by applying them to one and another of the various sects named. But I regard the apostle, on the whole, as designing rather 'to refute error by teaching the truth,' than as having engaged in designs directly and avowedly polemic. *Avowedly*, indeed, they certainly are not; for where in his Gospel has he referred expressly to any of the sects named? That what he says may have some bearing upon them, and actually does have one, I cannot well doubt. But that the apostle entered the lists as a *disputant*, does not seem from the tenor of his writings, at large, to be capable of satisfactory proof.

NOTE 20. *Time and place of composing the Gospel of John; language in which it was written.* (§ 64. p. 455.)

On these questions the author has given but little information, and nothing to satisfy the critical inquirer. In § 65—70, he endeavours indeed to shew, that John's first Epistle was written to the churches at Ephesus, while the author was in a state of banishment at Patmos; that his Gospel was also probably written at the same place; and that the first Epistle was in fact written as an accompaniment and designed as a kind of introduction to the Gospel. As Hug supposes the banishment of John to have taken place under Domitian, he of course must suppose the Gospel and the first Epistle not to have been written until about A. D. 97 or 98.

Of Hug's views respecting John's first Epistle, I shall speak in the sequel. In opposition to his view respecting the *late* composition of John's Gospel, several suggestions may be made.

(1) John 5: 2, ἔστι δὲ ἐν τοῖς ἱεροσολύμοις . . . κολυμβήθρα. After all that has been said about *enallage temporis*, in the New Testament, and specially in John, there is solid reason to distrust the confounding of tenses by any writer of common sense. We may be, and often are, ignorant how often one *Praeterite*, for example, was employed in the place of another, because that other had gone into desuetude, or was cacophonous; in such a case we are not well qualified to judge about *enallage temporis*; certainly not to decide that the instance in question is one of this nature. In some other instances it is a matter of indifference which of two or three *Praeterites* is used, inasmuch as the nature of the case admits either to be employed without any impropriety. We should not be hasty, therefore, in making out these enallages of tense; which, if absolutely taken, only mean that a writer has voluntarily, or through ignorance, violated the common laws of the Greek language. To say, then, that ἔστι is here put for ἦν, is saying something which should not be said without some definite and satisfactory ground. But to assume, in the first place, that the Gospel of John was written near the close of the first century, and then to construe ἔστι as if it were ἦν, is a *ύστερον πρότερον* in argument.

Still, the city of Jerusalem may have been destroyed, and the baths or bath-house rebuilt, when John wrote his Gospel. Eusebius (Onomasticon, v. Βηζηθά) speaks of the pool, etc., as well known in his time. The designation of place by ἐπὶ τῇ προβατικῇ, may be understood as meaning the place which was *anciently* called by this name. All this is possible; nor can it be pronounced to be very improbable. Still my impression from reading the whole Gospel of John is, that if Jerusalem had been laid in ruins before he wrote it, some hint, some expression of feeling in relation to this melancholy event, some appeal to the notable prophecy of the Saviour respecting it as having been fulfilled, must have appeared here or there in the Gospel. How could John every where so completely suppress the rising and even involuntary sigh which would heave his breast? How could he fail to mention so striking and palpable a proof, that Jesus was the Messiah, the duly commissioned Messenger of God? At all events, the most natural exe-

egesis of John 5: 2 is, that when John wrote, Jerusalem was then in the like state and condition as at the time when the Saviour performed the miracle at Bethesda.

Again (3) in John 21: 18 the words of our Saviour respecting Peter's martyrdom are related. As this took place in A. D. 67, or near this time, how could John, or (if any one denies the genuineness of this 21st chapter), how could some disciple of his who published John's Gospel and added this last chapter, have omitted to refer to the death of Peter, which had happened some 30 years before, if Hug and others who think with him are to be credited?

The fact that John employs ἦν (Imperf.) instead of the present tense (ἔσται), in reference to places, in 18: 1. 19: 41. 11: 18, proves nothing, as the matter is respectively circumstanced. The historian is in each case relating *past* events; and in such a case, nothing is more common or natural than to speak of the *place* where these events happened, in the *past* tense. This is all which can be made out, from such instances as these.

When the appeal is made to John 21: 23, "If I will that he [John] should continue until I come, what is that to thee?" as affording an argument in favour of this Gospel being written in the advanced age of John; there seems to be no force in the appeal, unless we assume, that Jesus could not have uttered this in a prophetic way, so that John could understand it until he should have attained to an advanced age. But what dependence can we place on an argument of such a nature?

Finally, when writers appeal to the *Greek style* of John's Gospel, and tell us that it bears marks of great improvement upon that of the Apocalypse, and shews that John had been many more years conversant with the Greek language when he wrote the former; I cannot sympathize with them, and do not so judge. Let Winer's *Programm* on the alleged *soloecisms* of the Apocalypse be read; let the reader be deeply conversant with the Hebrew prophets and familiar with their style and manner, their abrupt transitions, change of person, Nominatives independent, and the like; then let him call to mind the perfectly simple and prosaic character of John's Gospel in its narrations, and the close imitation (as we have good reason to believe), or the exact report, of Jesus' discourses even in the manner of their diction; let him afterwards come to the reading of the Apocalypse, and mark how the diction of every part of it is built upon the Hebrew prophets, how entirely it is Hebrew poetry in its very soul and essence, how exceedingly diverse the *matter* of it is from that of the Gospels, and how diverse the *manner* must be also in order to present the genuine stamp of Hebrew prophetic composition—let him take all this into view, and also the further fact that the text of the Apocalypse is as yet less purified than that of any other book of the New Testament; and he will then hesitate about drawing an argument as to the *lateness* of John's Gospel, from the superior character of its Greek. This superiority, I am fully persuaded, cannot be satisfactorily made out.

In a word, the testimonies of the ancients are, that John removed from Palestine to Asia Minor, where he taught extensively, and fixed his abode at Ephesus. So Clemens Alex. in Euseb. Hist. Ecc. III. 23. Irenaeus, advers. Haeres. I. 2. c. 22. § 5. I. 3. c. 1. c. 3. § 4. Origen,

in Euseb. H. E. III. 1. Polycrates, bishop of Ephesus, in Euseb. III. 31. Jerome, Catal. Scriptt. c. 9. That John must have gone there after Paul wrote his epistles, would seem clear from the fact, that neither his presence nor labours are adverted to in Rom. 15: 20. 2 Cor. 10: 16; nor in the epistles to the Colossians, Ephesians, or Timothy, written when Paul was in prison at Rome. John therefore must have gone to Ephesus, after A. D. 60 or 62.

That he wrote his Gospel at *Ephesus*, the more ancient witnesses agree; e. g. Irenaeus, advers. Haeres. III. 1. Eusebius, Ecc. Hist. III. 24. V. 8. VI. 14. Jerome, Catal. Scriptt. c. 9. That he wrote it after the three other Gospels were written, these witnesses also declare; and so Storr, Herder, and most modern critics have felt inclined to decide. But this latter position can never be satisfactorily made out.

The reader who wishes for more ample discussion, may consult the various Introductions to the New Testament, and in particular those of Lampe to his Comm. in Johan.; Wegscheider, Versuch einer vollständiger Einleitung, etc., p. 190 seq. Lücke Comm. über Johannem. I. p. 121 seq. Schott's Isagoge, §§ 36—43.

*That John wrote in Greek*, the examples of explanation in regard to Hebrew words and things, referred to by Hug in § 64, would seem abundantly to shew. Why should he interpret the most common and obvious Hebrew words, (מָשִׁיחַ, גִּבְרִיתָהּ, כִּיפָּה, etc.), if he were writing in Hebrew, and for Hebrew readers?

It is to be regretted that Hug, instead of occupying his readers, as he has done, with speculations about the *supplementary* character of John's Gospel, had not given more of substantial discussion in respect to other circumstances, in which we have a deeper interest.

#### NOTE 21. *First Epistle of John.* (§ 65. p. 456.)

The very first declaration with which Hug commences his account of this Epistle, is one which I should be far from regarding as certain. On the other hand, I find nothing in all the first epistle of John, which obliges me to suppose that he refers in it to his *written* Gospel. That there is the same doctrine in the Epistle as in the Gospel, the same style or manner of writing both as to diction and the construction of sentences, the same glowing spirit of love to God and man, the same ardent attachment to the Saviour and zeal for his honour and glory—must be evident, I think, to every intelligent and impartial reader. From the most ancient times this has been acknowledged and felt. Scarcely a doubt has been raised, until recently, in respect to the *genuineness* of this first Epistle; notwithstanding it has neither *subscription* nor *inscription*. But all this does not shew, that it was designed as a preface, or an accompaniment, or a defence, to the Gospel of John. All this, moreover, we may suppose and fully credit, without drawing any other conclusion from the reading of the epistle, than that John had preached



and taught familiarly and fully, among those whom he here addresses, the doctrines to which he specially adverts, particularly in the beginning of his Epistle, but occasionally elsewhere. That he addresses his own disciples, there can hardly be any doubt, if we look at the manner of his writing. How can it be shewn, as Hug assumes, that there is "a visible reference in the Epistle to the Gospel?"

Hug, however, stands not alone in respect to his views concerning the original design of this Epistle. Berger in his *Versuch einer moral. Einleit. ins. N. Test. II.* p. 118; Storr in his *Zweck der evang. Geschichte*, etc. p. 315 seq.; Augusti in his *Kathol. Briefe*, II. p. 182 seq., have suggested like views; one regarding it as containing a *practical* part of the Gospel or supplement to it, another as a *polemic* part in defence of it, and the third as a letter of recommendation or introduction to it. All these views the reader may find fully examined and refuted, in Lücke's Preface to his Comm. on this Epistle. How can it be accounted for, that all antiquity should have severed the epistle, as to its location in the Canon, from the Gospel, if it originally was combined or immediately connected with it? That in the Cod. Cantab., there stands at the end of John's Gospel and before the Acts a note by some transcriber, which would seem to signify that the Epistles of John end there, and the Acts follows (as Hug declares, p. 462), proves nothing, except that some erroneous or idle hand had added something in that place which does not belong there; or at the most, that instead of the Acts, the copyist meant at first to transcribe the Epistles of John, but afterwards abandoned his purpose.

To suppose, with Hug (p. 464), that John wrote his Gospel at *Patmos*, and must therefore have sent a *letter of introduction* with it, because he could not introduce it *in propria persona*, is arguing in a way sufficiently unsatisfactory. Why could not John have done as Luke did, i. e. send his Gospel to some distinguished individual friend, who, he well knew, would take care of it and publish it? Then, again, how could John have written his Gospel, in a state of *banishment*, and never have even once adverted in it to any thing which leads us at all to conjecture that such were his circumstances? Or how could his first epistle have been written in the like condition? Suppositions like those which Hug makes in relation to these matters, need at least some *probabilities* in their favour, in the absence of all ancient tradition and testimony in their behalf. Unfortunately they have neither the one nor the other to support them.

That the Epistle was written *later* than the Gospel, I should think quite probable from the tone of it. The various errors to which it apparently adverts, are here more definitely and strongly characterized and denounced than in the Gospel. The animadversions upon them seem to assume the decided tone of *repeated* admonition.

Different writers have found in this epistle opposition to different classes of heretics. Thus Loeffler finds *Jews* and *Judaizers* opposed; Dissert., Joan. Epist. I. Gnosticos imprimis impugnari negatur, in Comm. Theol. I. Others have supposed that *Judaizing Christians*, and *Ebionites* or apostate Christians, are opposed; e. g. Semler, in his Paraph. Johan.; Tittmann, in his *De Vestigiis Gnosticorum*, etc., p. 179 seq. Knapp, in his *Script. var. Argument*, p. 157. Lange, *Schrift.*

des Johann. III. 19 seq. Eichh. Einleit. II. 291 seq. Others suppose that the *Gnostics* were principally aimed at; e. g. Michaelis, II. ed. 4, p. 1522. Kleuker, Johannes, Petrus, and Paulus, als Christologen betrachtet, 1785. Others still have regarded the *Docetae* as the sect principally opposed in John's first Epistle; e. g. Schmidt, Einleit. II. p. 318. Bertholdt, Einleit. VI. p. 3250. Niemeyer, Comm. de Docetis, Halle, 1823. Lücke, Comm. Pref. p. 62 seq. So Vitranga also thought, Obs. Sac. V. 20; and so have many others. Schott and De Wette do not dissent from a modified view of this latter sentiment; while they do not suppose the *main* design of the epistle to have been in any good measure *polemic*.

That the heresy of the *Docetae*, who taught that Christ was only in appearance and seemingly, but not in reality, a man consisting of a real body and soul, was extant in the apostolic age, there seems to be no good reason to deny. That 1 John 1: 1—3 and 4: 1—6 were designed to oppose or gainsay the doctrine of this sect, one can scarcely doubt. What could be the object of the apostle in making such specific, repeated, and pointed asseverations respecting the *real humanity* of the Saviour, unless it were to oppose some error like that of the *Docetae*? Compare particularly 2 John, v. 7.

That in his first epistle, as in his Gospel, John designs to oppose several and various errors, in passing, I cannot well doubt. Let the reader examine chap. 2: 18—27. The *ἀντίχριστος* here characterized, no doubt means some particular erroneous opinions, or party schism (v. 19), or practical ungodliness, which prevailed to some extent in the church or churches whom the apostle addressed in his letter. All that we can learn, however, from the passage, warm and animated as the strain of it is, amounts to no more than the generic idea, that there was a theoretical or practical denial that Jesus is the Christ; see v. 22. This is afterwards called *denying the Son*; and he who does this, is said also to deny the Father. That some false teachers were actively engaged in spreading heretical sentiments in relation to this subject, is evident from v. 26, τῶν πλανῶντων ὑμᾶς. But whether these *deceivers* were Ebionites, Judaizers, Gnostics, or *Docetae*, or some other heretics, can not well be determined from the passage under examination.

Excepting this passage, and the two above adverted to, there is little in this epistle except warm-hearted and paternal admonition and exhortation to love, faith, mutual kindness, and good will. Holiness and benevolence the writer considers as indissolubly connected with steadfast faith in Christ, and adherence to the simple truths of his Gospel.

That John was somewhat advanced in life, when he wrote this epistle, seems probable from his use of the word *τεχνία* so often in his addresses. Yet those who rely very much on this should remember, that the Saviour addresses his disciples with the same appellation, in John 13: 33, some (probably most) of whom were older than himself. So Paul also addresses the Galatians, 4: 19. Evidently it is only a compellation of *endearment*. Or, if we argue from it in respect to the comparative age of the writer, what shall we say when John (2: 13) addresses a portion of those to whom he wrote by the appellation *πατέρες*? If any thing is thus to be deduced from these various compellations, it must be this, viz., that most of those whom John addressed were

younger than himself; while some others were older than himself. *Extreme old age*, therefore, cannot be assumed by this mode of reasoning, as it has been by many, as the probable time of John's writing his first epistle. The *Geschwatzigkeit* (prattle) of old age, and senile repetitions, which Eichhorn and others have found in it, belong rather to their exegetical tact, than to the writer of the epistle.

Meagre and unsatisfactory, on the whole, is Hug's account throughout of the writings of John. The most interesting matters he has treated in a superficial way.

NOTE 22. *Second Epistle of John.* (§ 71. p. 465.)

In what manner Hug deduces from the language of this epistle, the conclusion that the apostle was *in exile* when he wrote it, I do not see. To argue from v. 7, "Having many things to write to you, I would not do it with *paper and ink*, for I hope to be with you, etc." that the apostle was in want of writing materials (p. 465), is singular indeed. Where then did he get materials for writing his Gospel and first Epistle, both of which, Hug supposes, were written in exile? How very singular, too, that the exile of Patmos should be in the habit of receiving familiar and friendly visits? (p. 465). Did the Roman Government permit exiles to lonely places to be treated thus?

Then again, how could John in exile for an indefinite time, expect *soon* to see the worthy individual to whom his second epistle is addressed, and speak with her face to face?

In a word; can we well doubt that the writer of 2 John was at *liberty*, when he wrote this Epistle?

As to the address, *ἐκλεκτῇ κυρίᾳ*, it seems at last to be pretty well agreed, that if *ἐκλεκτῇ* were designed to be considered as a *proper* name, the location would have been thus, *τῇ κυρίᾳ ἐκλεκτῇ*, or *ἐκλεκτῇ τῇ κυρίᾳ*. That *Κυρία* was often a proper name of females among the Greeks, there is no doubt; see Gruteri Inscriptt. p. 1127. Schott and De Wette both decide in favour of *Κυρία* (Cyria) as a proper name, and *ἐκλεκτῇ* as an epithet. From a comparison of 3 John, v. 1, this opinion seems to be probable.

As to the assumption of Hug, that this second letter of John was written immediately after the first, and despatched along with it—it seems to me as little supported, as that the first letter was written at the same time with his Gospel. How came it, that the second and third epistles of John were considered by some as of *doubtful* authenticity, even so early as the days of Origen; *δευτέραν καὶ τρίτην, ἐπεὶ οὐ πάντες φασὶ γνησίους εἶναι ταύτας*, are the words of Origen quoted in Euseb. Ecc. Hist. VI. 25. Had all three epistles been sent to the churches at the same time with the Gospel, and all been deemed as introductory to it, or explanatory of it, or as designed to enforce it, then would the *appendices* have been attached of course to the main volume, and gone into credit or discredit along with it. But here we find, so

early as the time of Origen, the genuineness of the second and third Epistles doubted; and Eusebius states explicitly (Hist. Ecc. III. 25), that the *second* and *third* of John were called in question by some; τῶν δὲ ἀντιλεγομένων . . . ἡ ὀνομαζομένη δευτέρα καὶ τρίτη Ἰωάννου. Jerome also states (De Viris Illust. c. 9), that these two epistles were assigned by some to John a presbyter at Ephesus.

Besides; they were left out of the Peshito or old Syriac version; which shews that they came into circulation *after* the Gospel and first Epistle had been current in the churches.

Why Hug should pass in silence all these facts, and thus take no notice of them, I know not. One thing, however, is plain, viz. that when known and fully considered, they must overthrow his theory in regard to the second and third epistles of John.

As to the doubts themselves which have been raised in ancient or in modern times against the genuineness of the second and third epistles of John, they are inconsiderable. Even De Wette does not think that they amount to any thing serious; and Lücke, Bertholdt, Schott, and others, have abundantly removed them. The *internal* evidence is so strong, that there is hardly serious room for doubt. In ancient times, it would seem that doubts had arisen whether they should be included in the canon, rather from the fact that these epistles were directed to *private* individuals, than from any other circumstance.

#### NOTE 23. *Third Epistle of John.* (§ 72. p. 466).

Here again is the same singular mistake in our author, of supposing that John complains of the want of *writing materials*, and that this is good evidence of his being in exile. John says (v. 13), "I have much to write, but I will not do it with ink and pen." Why? Not because he *could* not. He does not say οὐ δύναμαι γράψαι, but οὐ θέλω γράψαι. But why *would* he not? Because he expected soon to see his friend, and tell him mouth to mouth the *many things* he had to say, instead of writing them. What can be a more natural circumstance in a letter than this?

Then, again, as to the state of *exile*; John says (v. 15), ἀσπάζονται σε οἱ φίλοι, *the friends salute thee*. So then, this lonely exile was surrounded by his friends.

Who Gaius (Caius) was, we know not, excepting that he appears to have been one of the apostle's spiritual children, and to have merited and enjoyed much of his confidence. That he belonged to Ephesus, and that a party there, of which Diotrephes was the head, had rejected an epistle written to them by John, v. 9, (i. e. the first epistle of John, according to Hug), rests not only upon mere conjecture, but on very improbable conjecture. Is there any thing in the other writings of John, which favours the predominance of such a party at Ephesus? Rather, does not Rev. 2: 1 seq. make directly *against* such a supposition?

Much more probable does it seem to me, that when the apostle wrote



his second and third epistles, he was at Ephesus, on the eve of setting out upon one of his evangelical journeys among the churches; that having some private opportunity to write to Gaius and to Cyria before he could visit them, he embraced it. In the course of his journey he expected to see them.

That the two epistles were written at the same time, or under the same circumstances, seems probable from a comparison of 2 John vs. 1, 12 with 3 John vs. 1, 13, 14. That Gaius and Cyria both lived in the same place, is not certain; that they did not, cannot be proved.

That 2 John v. 7—11 refers to the same deceivers which are characterized in the first epistle, 1: 1—3. 4: 1—6, seems to be quite plain. But that such deceivers were to be found only at Ephesus, and that Cyria and Gaius must have lived there, as Hug would seem to maintain,—who can vouch for this?

NOTE 24. *Discrepancy in Genealogies.* (§ 74, p. 469 seq.)

Hug (p. 469) calls the attempt to trace the descent of *Mary* in Luke an “evasion” of the difficulty in respect to the genealogies, and says that “it does *violence* to the phraseology employed.” What then is the violence done in this case? It is simply this, viz., that Joseph, the acknowledged and actual *son in law* of Heli, is counted by the Evangelist Luke (3: 23), as a *son*. But what does Hug himself, in the like way, in his own attempt at conciliation? He introduces at least two several cases, in which the so-called *son* of a man, is actually the son of some other person. ‘Jechonias,’ he says, ‘had no children.’ And yet Salathiel is reckoned as his *son*, whose actual father was Neri, and grandfather Melchi, according to Luke (3: 27, 28). Again; ‘Salathiel (or Shealtiah) has no son; Pedaiah his brother, therefore, raises up for him a son, whose name is *Zerubbabel*.’ Yet in the case of Jechonias, even this law of the *levirate* was not fulfilled; for ‘Jechonias had no brothers to raise up seed for him,’ p. 471. Is this solving the *nodus*, then, without a “violence” like that complained of in others?

But this is not all. Hug has omitted other serious difficulties that stand in the way of his theory. In Matthew, the son of Zerubbabel is called *Abiud*; in Luke, *Resa*; in 1 Chron. 3: 19, 20, *seven* sons are assigned to him, but no one has either of these names.

Hug notices that the name *Abiud* does not stand in 1 Chron. 3: 19, 20. He proposes to account for this, by the conjecture that *Abiud* is only a *name of affection*, i. e. a kind of nick-name, by which Meshullam, or Hananiah, was called; like the Arabic *Abi* or *Abu*, so often attached to proper names. But what is to be done with *-oud* in the name *Abi-oud*, he does not tell us. How can we be satisfied with such etymology as this?

It is gratifying to find, that in a note on p. 472, he retracts his singular and unfounded criticism on מְלִיכִי-רְמִיָּה etc. on p. 471.

After all, however, he has left untouched a difficulty greater than any

which he has encountered. How should all the line from Zorobabel downward in Matthew, be *different* from that in Luke, on the supposition that Salathiel and Zerubbabel in both Evangelists are the same? Who is the Rhesa of Luke, reckoned by him as the son of Zerubbabel? No such person appears in 1 Chron., nor in Matthew. And even if we allow that Abiud in Matthew is a *cognomen amoris*, and that the real person is the same as Resa in Luke, yet the same difficulty is to be met again in the first link of subsequent descent, and in all the remaining ones. The son of Resa was *Joanna*, and then come Juda, Joseph, Semei, etc. In Matthew we have Zorobabel, Abioud, Eliakim, Azur, etc. This leaves all the work of Hug to be done over again; inasmuch as we are utterly at a loss, how two lines from Zorobabel (he being the same person in Matthew and in Luke), should be wholly discrepant all the way down for 500 years, and yet both end in the same person, viz., Joseph the husband of Mary.

Whence did these family genealogies come? From family records, we can scarcely doubt. Otherwise, i. e. if the accounts of the Evangelists differed from those in the genealogies, the Jews who were unfriendly to Christianity would of course appeal to the evident discrepancy as evidence that the Gospels were not worthy of credit. Were there *two* genealogies then of Joseph, so entirely discrepant from each other, and yet both *authentic* family records? That seems like an utter improbability, upon bare inspection of the nature of this case among the Jews, whose modes of counting genealogy were definite and settled.

Let us look now at another circumstance. In Matthew, the father of Joseph is *Jacob*; then we have Matthan, Eleazer, Eliud, Achim, etc. In Luke we have ὅν, ὃς ἐνομιζέτο, υἱὸς Ἰωσήφ (Jesus), and then the father of Joseph is called *Heli*, and the other ancestors are Matthat, Levi, Melchi, Janna, etc. Is it possible now that family records should have so computed the genealogy of Joseph as the proper son of Heli, etc.? Surely not, in case Matthew is in the right. And did not an apostle and early disciple of Jesus, who was personally acquainted with all his relatives after the flesh—did he not know what were the authentic records of Joseph's descent? Would he make use of any which the Jews could gainsay?

We come then, in this way, to the necessary conclusion, that in Luke the genealogy of Joseph as the *son in law* (and probably as *adopted* son also) of Heli is counted; i. e. that the genealogy of Mary is in fact reckoned. The very language of Luke seems to indicate something of this nature: ὅν, ὃς ἐνομιζέτο, υἱὸς Ἰωσήφ. Jesus was then only the *supposed* or *imagined* son of Joseph. When the historian says this, would he then go on to reckon a mere *imaginary* genealogy, or would he count it in the line where it really and truly belonged, i. e. in the line of his mother?

That *adopted* sons and *sons in law* might be reckoned in genealogies, there can be no good reason to doubt. I can hardly hesitate then to believe, that Luke has here in reality reckoned the genealogy of Mary, but, in compliance with the Jewish method, has put her husband at the head of the catalogue. If this be not so, then we have no genealogical proof exhibited in the New Testament, that Jesus Christ is the Son of David according to the flesh, or a real descendant from him. This

would, to say the least, be a marvellous circumstance, considering how much stress the Jews laid upon this matter.

This whole subject of the *genealogy* of Jesus, which has been a stumbling block to so many critics and has been scoffed at by so many unbelievers, needs a more thorough investigation than it has yet received, and might be made more credible and intelligible than many have hitherto deemed it to be. But the limits of these notes forbid my going any further into it. Commentators can be consulted by the reader; but he will find most of them to give him but little satisfaction.

Hug has given us no account in this place of the recent attempts to overthrow the credit of Matthew's Gospel. David Schulz, in his *Christliche Lehre vom heilig. Abendmahl*, 1824, in a *Beilage* to this volume; Orelli, *Selecta Capita*, etc., 1821; Schulthess, in *biblisch-exeget. Repertorium* by K. and H. Rosenmüller, B. II. 1824; Wilke in Winer's *Zeitschrift* for 1826; and Fischer, in his *Einleitung in die Dogmatik*, 1828; have, in various ways, moved doubts of the authenticity of Matthew's Gospel. A summary of their grounds the reader will find in Schott's *Isagoge*, § 23, pp. 73 seq. More at length he will find the discussion of these doubts, and arguments to remove them, by Theile, in Winer and Engelhardt's *Kritisches Journal*, B. II. 1824; by Heydenreich, in the same *Journal*, B. III.; also in Bengel's *Archiv*, B. VI.; in Fritsche's *Comm. in Matt.*, Proleg. § 21; and in Guericke's *Beiträge*, 1828, p. 23 seq. The grounds of doubt are partly such as might be assumed against all the Evangelists, partly of very little moment, and partly made up of alleged facts that are mistaken ones. My limits do not permit me here even to recapitulate them. I cannot for a moment suppose, that the general opinion of the churches respecting the Gospel of Matthew, will be at all affected by them.

In respect to the alleged discrepancies between Luke's account of the purification and of the presentation of the child Jesus in the temple (2: 22—39), and Matthew's account of the flight to Egypt and the subsequent return of Joseph and his abode at Nazareth (2: 13—23), the notes in Newcome's *Harmony* may be consulted, which will give more satisfaction than Hug's account of the matter (p. 473). What hinders the supposition, that the visit of the Magi was *after* the presentation? Luke 2: 39 cannot well be interpreted so strictly as to leave no space of time before the final abode of Joseph and Mary at Nazareth; unless, indeed, we insist on a strictness here of *ὡς ἐτέλεσαν*, etc., which we are obliged to remit elsewhere. The flight to Egypt would occupy about some forty hours' travelling; the abode there was probably very short. Herod died in the thirty-seventh year of his reign; but as we cannot be certain in what year of this Jesus was born, so we cannot with definite certainty fix the length of time that was spent by Joseph in Egypt. At all events, there is no serious difficulty in respect to this matter.



NOTE 25. *Visit of the Magi to Bethlehem.* (p. 474 seq.)

I am unable to discover, from the tenor of Hug's remarks, whether he regards the visit of the Magi, etc., as any thing more than the result of astrological superstition. Note 3 on p. 474 seems as if he meant to commend to our notice the pilgrims of his church and their quasi-miraculous guidance, or else to represent the whole thing as an affair of superstition; or at least he would seem to mean, that we should take advantage of these superstitious views in order to illustrate Matt. 2: 1—12. It is somewhat extraordinary, that he should regard the *star* in this case as a real celestial body, and yet undertake to shew that "it stood over the place where the young child was." It was over that *region*, says he. Indeed? This might have been so. But if it were like other fixed stars or planets, it was over a larger portion of the globe, than the region of Bethlehem.

The facts lying at the basis of this whole matter, seem to me to be few and simple. Over all the East, as even Tacitus and Suetonius assure us, there was an expectation, at the time when Jesus was born, that some distinguished and universal king was speedily to arise out of Judea. Doubtless the Jews in the East had given occasion to such an expectation, and had deduced the notion of it themselves from the Old Testament prophecies. The Magi were a class of men devoted to the study of science, particularly astronomy and religion. In the case related by Matthew, they might have been Jews or heathen. Daniel himself was at the head of the Magi in Babylon; and Jews therefore may have belonged to this class of men.

An extraordinary meteor (*ἀστὴρ*) appeared, and the general interpretation of astrologers would lead the Magi to suppose, that an extraordinary king was born. It appeared in the direction of Judea; therefore the distinguished king so generally expected, was probably born there. They set out to offer homage; not, as I apprehend, simply from the suggestions of their own mind, but by the direction of a special Providence. It is plain, from v. 9, that on their way the star had ceased to appear. When they had set out from Jerusalem for Bethlehem, it *reappeared*, and led the way (*προῆγεν αὐτοὺς*), until "it came and stood over where the young child was." To affirm this of a star in the heavens, like other fixed stars or planets, would be a most palpable error, which every man's experience would enable him to detect. The appearance, the motion, and the direction of this *ἀστὴρ*, are plainly and palpably supposed by the Evangelist to be *extraordinary* and *supernatural*. Hug, in endeavouring to avoid the admission of this, has suggested considerations which will give very little satisfaction to the minds of the doubters whom he means to convince, and still less to those who feel no need of explaining away supernatural phenomena.

NOTE 26. *Genuineness of several passages.* (p. 476 seq.)

I must remit the reader to the *critical* editions of the New Testament, Mill, Wetstein, Griesbach, Matthaei, Scholz, etc.; also to such



commentaries as discuss these matters, e. g. those of Kuinoel, Fritsche, Paulus, Olshausen, and others, for a more full account of critical doubts, and the solution of them. Schott, in his *Isagoge*, has given an able summary of them. But I cannot accede to all his doubts, nor to all his decisions.

---

NOTE 27. *Acts of the Apostles.* (§ 77 seq. p. 488 seq.)

I cannot think that the view of Hug (p. 490), in relation to Luke's long abode in Palestine before his union with Paul, is by any means well-supported. There is nothing in Luke's Gospel or in the Acts of the Apostles, which he might not have learned from eye and ear witnesses in Palestine. What was he doing, during the two years that Paul was in prison at Cesarea? Acts 24: 27. Abundance of time he had, and the best of opportunities, to investigate *ἅνωθεν* all which he has related in his Gospel, or in the first part of the Acts, respecting the occurrences in Palestine.

When Hug suggests (p. 491), that the *particularity* of the narrator, in the first part of the Acts, is proof of his having been an eye-witness, etc., I do not feel the force of this remark. The same writer was an eye-witness to many other events, which he relates very *summarily*. It was the *importance* of the events which took place in Palestine, I apprehend, which gave birth to Luke's particularity. Deeply interesting it was, to see the beginning of the kingdom of God among the Jews, and then its gradual development among the Gentiles.

That Luke did not design to give a *general* history of the apostles and of their labours, is plain; as Hug suggests. He follows on in the train of important incidents until the conversion of Paul. After this, his account of other matters than those which concerned Paul, is merely occasional and quite brief. Paul is evidently the great object of his story.

But to assume that the *Acts* was not published until *after* the death of Paul (§ 81), and the same even of the Gospel also, is assuming more than can in any way be established, and more, as I regard the matter, than can in any way be rendered probable. Hug supposes, that the reason why Luke has not given us any account of Paul's trial, his defence, his final sentence, the issue of it, and what took place during his imprisonment, must be, that Theophilus lived near the scene of action, and was acquainted with all that happened there. Of course, as he declares, he regards the book of Acts as written only for the private benefit of Theophilus.

Strange indeed all this will seem to most readers; at least it seems so to me. Theophilus acquainted with all that befel Paul at Rome! Why then does Luke relate the occurrences which are described in Acts 23: 16—31? Above all, why does he tell Theophilus, that 'Paul dwelt *two whole years* in a hired house at Rome, preaching and teach-

ing continually, as opportunity occurred? Did Theophilus, then, who was personally acquainted with all which befel the apostle there, need to be advertised of this? The supposition is little short of preposterous; and not far from this (at least so I must view the subject), is the deduction, that Luke wrote his book *after* the death of Paul.

The very face of the last part of the narration is against this. Why does Luke stop short with the *two years* of imprisonment? Because one would naturally say, the time when he wrote his book permitted him to go no further. Surely if Luke wrote for readers who felt a peculiar interest in the history of Paul, (and who will not assent to this?) then, after giving such a detailed account of every thing that befel Paul, from the time of his first apprehension at Jerusalem until he was brought to Rome as a prisoner, he could not have failed to proceed with the account of his trial and of the final issue of it. I take it for granted, in this remark, that there is no substantial ground for Hug's theory here, either in respect to the mere *private* design of Luke's Gospel and book of Acts, or in regard to Theophilus' *personal* knowledge of matters respecting Paul at Rome. Having taken so much pains to tell his readers, then, about the apprehension of Paul, his first trial, appeal, journey to Rome, etc., is it within the bounds of any probability, that Luke would not have said something of Paul's *final* trial and the issue of it, in case he wrote the Acts *after* the death of the apostle? The case seems to me so plain, as not to need further effort to illustrate it.

If this be correct, then the writing of the *Gospel* of Luke must have been still earlier; for at the very commencement of the Acts, Luke refers to his Gospel, and calls it τὸν πρῶτον λόγον. This would seem, therefore, to fix the date of the Gospel at a period *antecedent* to some 62 or 64 years after the beginning of the Christian era.

The characteristics of the book of Acts are not explicitly given by Hug. It would seem that Luke used, in the composition of his work, some *written* notices of events and addresses. The preaching of Peter, the addresses of Stephen, the various addresses of Paul, James, and others, instead of being all conformed to one model, viz. to the model of the author's own style, preserve respectively all the discrepancies and distinctions of style and manner which we could have expected originally from their authors; and they thus shew, that they have been preserved and related with great care and fidelity. In Xenophon, Thucydides, Livy, and other Greek and Roman historians, we find all the various speakers adopting the style of the author himself; which shews that all of their speeches were composed by him. But not so in the Acts of the Apostles.

That Luke had some particular and *specific* object in view, in writing his book, has often been asserted, but never proved. It is plain, indeed, that he means to give the early history of Christianity as developed in Judea, and to give it somewhat particularly. After the religion of Jesus, however, began to be published among the Gentiles, we have almost nothing from our historian but accounts of the efforts made by Paul and his companions for that purpose. A general history of the church, therefore, Luke could not have intended. A particular account of Paul is no doubt his main design; but not for the sake of some

specific doctrinal object; unless, indeed, one should say (which he might do with some probability), that the main object of Luke is to shew, that the privileges and blessings of Christianity belong as truly to the Gentile as to the Jew.

*As to the style*; some of the peculiarities of Luke appear almost every where in the book of the Acts, when the narration is his own. These have been often and at great length pointed out. See Schott, *Isagoge*, § 46, Note 3.

*The genuineness of this book* has never been seriously called in question, either in ancient or modern times. The testimony of the ancients may be found abundantly in Lardner, Schmidt, and almost all the Introductions. See Schott, § 44, Note 2. De Wette (more suo) has suggested some doubts and suspicions, in his *Einleit.* § 114. A brief answer to them may be found in Schott, § 44, Note 3.

*The chronology* of the book of Acts is ably discussed by Hug. The leading recent authors on this subject he has mentioned in a note on p. 494. All the older writers, Lardner, Pearson (*Annales Paulini*), and many others, who have written the *Life of Paul*, discuss the same subject. Hensen, in his recent *Life of Paul*, and others in Introductions, Commentaries, etc. have all laboured in some way to cast light upon this matter. But still, there are some difficulties in respect to it which do not seem to have yet been fully overcome, and there is not sufficient ground, therefore, to fix *exact* dates with great confidence. The main difficulty lies in ascertaining the exact point of time, when the Aretas mentioned in 2 Cor. 11: 32, was king over Damascus, and the governor under him endeavoured to apprehend Paul. As the sway of this Arabian king over Damascus lasted for some time, to fix exclusively upon some definite point in this period is a matter of serious difficulty. But there is such a spirit of chronological inquiry awakened and abroad among able and learned men, that we need not despair of yet attaining to a better chronology of the events recorded in the New Testament.

NOTE 28. *Epistles to the Thessalonians.* (§§ 91—95. p. 512 seq.)

Whoever will be at the pains of comparing the texts referred to by Hug in § 92, must become entirely satisfied that Paul wrote the first epistle to the Thessalonians very soon after his arrival at Corinth, and therefore in the year 52 or 53. Equally plain is it, that the *second* epistle must have been written not long after the first, from the nature of the case which it presents, and the manner of the whole epistle. It appears from 2 Thess. 2: 1—3, that some one (probably belonging to the Thessalonian community) had forged an epistle in the name of Paul, designed, as it would seem, to urge upon the Thessalonians the idea that *the day of the Lord*, mentioned in Paul's first epistle, was *very near* at hand.



Whether this was done for mere party purposes, i. e. to encourage one party and terrify another; or whether fear or wanton conjecture gave birth to this supposititious epistle, we are not informed by Paul. However this may be, he did not deem it proper to leave the Corinthians in a state of doubt as to what he had written, and what he meant to inculcate by his first epistle. His second epistle therefore was written, in order to deliver them from false apprehensions created by the supposititious epistle, and also to set them right as to the interpretation of his own first letter to them. We may place the writing of the second epistle, in view of these facts, at Corinth, and at some time during the latter part of the year A. D. 53, or in the first part of 54.

It is truly surprising, that after the explanation here professedly made by Paul with respect to his meaning in the first epistle, when he declares that "*the day of the Lord will come as a thief in the night,*" etc., that a great number of commentators and critics of the present day, still assume it as a position made out, that Paul and all the other apostles and primitive Christians expected the *judgment-day* before the close of the then present generation of men. Is Paul then, I may be permitted to ask, to be regarded as a proper interpreter of his own meaning? Can the series of events to which he refers in 2 Thess. II. be well supposed to be all accomplished *during the generation then extant*? Can we suppose that the day of the Lord was so near as this at hand, when Paul declares that all solicitude on this subject, on the part of the Thessalonians, is groundless? 2 Thess. 2: 1, 2. To me it seems, that Paul undertook to correct the very interpretation of his words, in the first epistle, which is now every day made by some, not only of this but of kindred passages every where in the New Testament.

So has it been, too, with the *Apocalypse*. This book declares, at the commencement and at the end of it, that 'the Lord will come *quickly*,' and that "things which must *shortly* come to pass" (1: 1), were signified in vision to the holy seer. Yet this very book designates periods of a "time, times, and half a time," i. e. 42 months, symbolical of the period of the reign of Antichrist; also a period of 1000 years, symbolical of the duration of the Messiah's kingdom on earth; and then again another period of declension and of the prevalence of sin, before the end of the world. How now could the writer begin and end his book, when all this was in his mind or when he had already written it, with the apprehension that all which he predicted was to be accomplished in his own life-time, or at farthest during the period of the generation then living? This supposition is preposterous in itself. Yet the evidence in the New Testament in respect to the *speedy* coming of the Lord, is no where in a shape more urgent and decisive than it seems to be in this very book. The simple truth appears to be, that the *series* of events by which the prophecy of the book was to be fulfilled, was to *commence* and did commence very speedily. The book itself, as I apprehend, was written just before the invasion of Judea by the Roman power, which ended in laying waste the country and destroying the capital; and this I regard as the subject of chap. IV.—XI.

If possible, however, the language in respect to the speedy coming of the Lord seems to be stronger in 1 Thess. V., than even in the *Apocalypse*. What says Paul? "The day of the Lord cometh like a thief



in the night," i. e. suddenly and unexpectedly. So the next verse explains it again, "*Sudden* destruction shall come upon them." But what peculiar interest had the Thessalonians in all this? The apostle seems to tell them what interest they ought to take in it: "Ye, brethren, are not in darkness, that *the day should overtake you as a thief.*" How could Paul have signified more plainly, we are ready at first reading to exclaim, that the Thessalonians were every hour exposed to the sudden and unexpected coming of the day of the Lord? Yet after all this, it appears by the apostle's second letter to the Thessalonians, that all he meant to say, was designed to console and fortify the minds of the Thessalonians, and to assure them, that the sudden destruction which awaited the wicked was not intended for them, or at least, that they need not live in terror respecting it. Comp. 2 Thess. 2: 1, 2. It would also seem, that what he had said respecting the sudden coming of the Lord and consequent destruction of the wicked, was also designed for the encouragement of Christians to persevere in their obedience to Christ. But they understood him, or at least the supposititious letter already adverted to seems to have led them to understand him, as saying, that this destruction of the wicked might be expected during the generation then living. But even this Paul did not mean; although his words certainly seem to be capable, at first view, of being interpreted in this manner. He assures the Thessalonians, in his second epistle, that the wicked are not to be destroyed by the coming of the Lord, until Antichrist, or *the man of sin, the son of perdition*, shall have been fully developed.

Is this *man of sin*, now, an *individual* or a *series of individuals*; a professed but apostate Christian or a heathen? Has he already appeared, or is he yet to come? Did he begin his development in the days of Paul, and continue it successively down to the present period (like the fulfilment of the prediction in the Apocalypse), or is the whole development still to be made?

These questions cannot be answered here; for a volume of discussion would be required, in order to establish any one of the opinions suggested by them, and refute such as would differ from it. Of course it is impossible to enter seriously into the discussion, in a limited note like the present. Whoever will be at the pains to compare 1 John 2: 18—29. 4: 1—6. 2 John vs. 7—10; also Jude vs. 4—20, and 2 Pet. 3: 3—15; and finally Rev. XIII. XIV., will be deeply impressed with the conviction, that one and all of the New Testament writers had the apprehension of a great falling off from the Christian church, and of great opposition and enmity to it either on the part of the apostasy, or on the part of others, or of both. Difference of light and shade is thrown by each writer into his own individual picture; and probably some have sketched one part of it and some another; but that all the writers had parts of the *same generic* idea or representation in their minds, I think will hardly be questioned by the inquisitive and investigating reader.

That the prophecy of Paul in 2 Thess. II. is to be interpreted in a less specific and definite manner than has sometimes been done, any one who is familiar with the interpretation of the Hebrew prophecies will hardly call in question. Hug (p. 515) refers the whole to *idolatry*. He doubtless knew that many among Protestant expositors have refer-

red it to his own church, i. e. to the *Papal* power. But must not the *beginning* of the fulfilment be nearer to the time when the apostle wrote, than the *sixth* century and the dark ages that followed? Are the *man of sin, the beast, the false prophet*, any thing more or less than symbols of enemies and persecutors of the church, and apostates and deserters from it, of every or any age, of every and any condition? Questions, which remain yet to be satisfactorily answered on proper *exegetical* grounds, but which would be well worth the time and pains of some able interpreter of the Scriptures. It is to be regretted that some of the most able interpreters have not recently taken up the epistles to the Thessalonians, and given them a more extended and radical investigation than they have yet received.

---

NOTE 29. *Epistle to Titus.* (§§ 96 seq. p. 515 seq.)

Hug, in his anxiety to establish his views as to the *time* and *place* of this epistle, has omitted most of the circumstances which particularly interest the critical inquirer.

It appears from Gal. 2: 3, that Titus was a *Greek* by birth. From the context here it is also evident, that he was a confidant and a chosen companion of Paul. He was also a confidential messenger of the apostle to the churches; see 2 Cor. 7: 6, 13, 14. 8: 6, 16, 23. 12: 18. We can have no difficulty, therefore, in giving credit to what is said (Tit. 1: 1—5), in respect to the apostle's affection for him, or the important charge which he committed to him.

The declaration in Tit. 1: 5, shews clearly that Paul had himself been in Crete and preached the gospel there. But of this we have no account in the book of Acts; and therefore the probability as to the time when, and the occasion on which, he made this journey, are to be made out, if indeed they can be, from the circumstances of some journey related in the book of the Acts.

Paul mentions in his epistle to Titus (3: 12), that he was going to winter in *Nicopolis*. But of the fact that he did so, Luke has nowhere advertised us in his history of Paul. And, what makes this more difficult still, there were many cities of this name; several in Asia Minor, one in Epirus, one near mount Haemus in Moesia, one on the Ister or Danube in the same province, another near the river Nestor in the south-east part of Thrace, and another in Egypt. Which of all these was meant by Paul, seems not yet to have been made out with any good degree of satisfaction.

The reader who attempts to trace out and find in the book of Acts, *all* the journeys or transactions of Paul which are designated even in his epistles, will surely be disappointed. Nothing can be more certain, than that Luke has given us an account of only a moderate portion of either the labours, the sufferings, or the journeyings of Paul. For example; Paul, speaking of his own experience in 2 Cor. 11: 23 seq.; says: "In labours more abundant, in stripes above measure, in prisons

more frequent, in deaths oft. Of the Jews five times received I forty stripes save one, thrice was I beaten with rods, once was I stoned, thrice I suffered shipwreck, a night and day have I been in the deep; in journeying often, in perils of waters, in perils of robbers, etc." In Rom. 15: 19 he tells us that he had travelled even to *Illyricum*, and preached the Gospel there; which region comprehends the modern Croatia and Dalmatia, on the eastern shore of the gulf of Venice. From these and many other notices of the same kind in Paul's epistles, it is altogether evident, that we are not to look for a *full* and *complete* account of his labours and travels in the book of Acts.

Accordingly we have *no where* an account of his sailing to Crete, excepting that when he was carried to Rome, the vessel in which he was embarked landed for a short time at Phenice, a harbor on the west-northwest part of the island, Acts 27: 12. There is not even a remote probability that Paul at this time went on shore and preached. Different writers have therefore made out by *conjecture*, the occasion on which, or the voyage during which, he first touched at Crete and preached the Gospel.

Hug (§ 96) supposes Paul to have sailed by Crete, when he left Corinth (after his first abode there of 18 months), and sailed from Cenchrea (Acts 18: 18), the *eastern* port of Corinth, which opened into the *Sinus Saronicus* or Grecian Bay. But the reader may easily see how improbable this is, by tracing the way over the Grecian sea from Cenchrea to Ephesus, where the apostle landed, Acts 18: 19. It would at least have *trebled* his distance, to have gone round by Crete. Nor is this all. Not a word in the history of this voyage intimates any storm, any deflection of the ship from the regular course, any stop or landing, or any apostolical labours in preaching.

Others think that Paul made a voyage to Crete, during his 18 months' abode at Corinth, when he first went to that city, Acts, 18: 11. So Michaelis, Einleit. II. 1315.

Others, again, suppose the apostle to have gone there during his *second* visit of three months at Corinth (Acts 20: 3); e. g. Heinrichs in Comm., Lardner, Lightfoot, and others.

Others suppose that Paul went thither during his second visit to Ephesus, where he abode some three years, Acts 20: 31. So Schmid, Einleit. I. 265.

Böhl, in his Ueber die Zeit der Abfassung und d. Paulin. Character der Briefe an Timotheus und Titus, 1829, has fully discussed all these suppositions, and shewn at least that none of them have any very inviting claim upon our belief. Still, as the argument against the claims of some of these suppositions must be founded principally or merely on the *silence* of Luke in his history; and as we know that he did pass in *silence* many important events of Paul's life: one can hardly feel himself to be satisfied with objections simply of this nature.

On account of the difficulties, however, which attend the respective suppositions above mentioned, many critics of name have been led to suppose, that Paul's visit to Crete was *later* than any of which we have a written narrative, and therefore that it took place *after* his liberation from his *first* imprisonment at Rome, and *before* his second. So Mill, Le Clerc, Bertholdt, Mynster, Guerike, Heydenreich, and Böhl. It



would seem that this is the attitude which most of the recent critics are inclined to take. But as the second imprisonment of Paul at Rome is loudly called in question, of late, by some intelligent critics, we are met here again with occasion of doubt and difficulty.

More recent than any of the writings above named, is the solid, learned, and truly excellent work of Hensen, late Professor at Göttingen, and University-Precacher there, entitled *Leben Pauli*, i. e. *Life of Paul*, published in part after the author's death, by F. Lücke, Professor at the same University, who has furnished it with a *Preface*, which does equal honour to himself and Hensen. The work is not, as might be supposed from merely reading the title, one of biography simply; it is designed to be, and is, a *critical introduction* to the epistles of Paul, as well as a historical account of his labours. As a *general historical and critical introduction* to the reading of his epistles, it is the best with which I have any acquaintance. The author is always grave, serious, disinclined to extravagant and conceited theories; and withal, a supernaturalist and of evangelical sentiments. In most cases, I can agree somewhat readily with his critical results. But as he here adopts the same views with Hug; and as the whole basis of this theory must be laid in the assumption, first that Paul in journeying from Corinth to Ephesus (Acts 18: 18, 19), went round by the way of Crete, and secondly that at Ephesus he met with Apollos soon after this, and helped to instruct him in the Christian faith, and before his first departure from that place (Acts 18: 21) wrote to Titus a letter in commendation of Apollos (Tit. 3: 13),—as all this must be *assumed* (for surely it cannot be proved), it appears to my mind to be too large a demand in this way. Indeed the second particular seems to be evidently against the tenor of the history in Acts 18: 24—28. If Paul had actually seen and instructed Apollos, it is easy to perceive how much more it would have been to the purpose of the historian, whose aim was to commend this eloquent disciple, to give the reader some hint of it. But as he has not done this, it is too much now to ask, in this case, that we should assume it.

But I must refer the reader to the temperate and able discussion of Hensen, pp. 193 seq., where he will find much ingenuity and great fairness in debate; but still, the difficulties stated above, as to the main positions, are not satisfactorily removed.

So much can be said with certainty; viz. that there was abundance of time during Paul's second visit to Ephesus and his three years abode there, to make one or more missionary excursions to Crete. See Acts xix. and 20: 31. That he did not do this, is not proved by the silence of Luke; that he did it, can not be fully shewn, for it depends only on conjecture which is not improbable.

The argument of Hug (on p. 516 seq.), in order to shew that Paul landed at Crete during his voyage from Cenchrea to Ephesus, after his first visit to Corinth (Acts 18: 18, 19), we have seen to be apparently destitute of probability by reason of the *circumstances* of that voyage. Nor is the author more fortunate, in my apprehension, in making out the probability from the *facts* in relation to Apollos. Let the reader carefully peruse Acts 18: 18—28 and 19: 1, and he must naturally come, as it seems to me, to the conclusion that Apollos did not reach Ephesus until *after* the first departure of Paul from it, Acts 18: 21. On



Paul's second coming to Ephesus (Acts 19: 1), Apollos was already gone to Corinth. From thence he might have gone to Crete, after Paul had himself been there and laid the foundations of a Christian church. At Ephesus Paul would of course have a full account of the character and labours of Apollos; and in like manner he could obtain the same from his beloved Christian friends at Corinth; and in case the apostle wrote to Titus at Crete, while he was himself at Ephesus, or afterwards, he might, if Apollos was there, say what he does in Tit. 3: 17 in a perfectly natural way. Clearly there is nothing *improbable* in all this.

Still, it all amounts to no more than a *possibility*, against which there seems to be no very formidable objections. But the supposition of Hug appears to me to be encompassed with great historical improbabilities.

The *genuineness* of the three *pastoral* epistles of Paul, was denied in ancient times by the Marcionites and the followers of Basilides, a Gnostic. Recently the apostolic origin of the *first* epistle to Timothy has been called in question by Schleiermacher, in his *Kritisches Sendschreiben über den ersten Brief an den Timotheus*; and the genuineness of *all three* was stoutly impugned by Eichhorn, in his *Einleitung*. The first named antagonist found an opponent in H. Planck, *Bemerkungen über den Brief an den Timotheus*, etc., 1808. Besides this author, Wegscheider in his *Comm.*; Bertholdt, *Einleit.* VI.; Bengel, *Archiv. B. I. St. 1*; Beckhaus, *Specimen Observatt. etc. de formulis in prima epistola ad Tim.*; Heydenreich, *Die Pastoralbriefe Pauli*, 1826; Guerike, *Beiträge*, etc., 1828; and G. Böhl, *Ueber die Zeit der Abfassung*, etc., der Briefe an Timotheus und Titus, 1829; have all discussed the subject of the genuineness of the *pastoral* letters of Paul. A very able and lucid summary of the principal points in the controversy, is given by Schott in his *Isagoge*, § 72 seq. To him, or to some of the authors above named, specially Planck, Böhl, and Hensen, I must, for want of room here, refer the reader. I will only add, that the genuineness of these epistles, so unanimously conceded by all the churches catholic of antiquity, has not, in my apprehension, been rendered doubtful by any of the attacks that have been made upon them.

If the supposition of Hug is not correct, with regard to the time when the epistle to Titus was written, it follows of course that the chronological order which he has given it in his Introduction is not to be regarded as the true one. Yet Hensen, as we have seen, defends the position of Hug. But the argument can never be made convincing.

#### NOTE 30. *Epistle to the Galatians.* (§ 99. p. 519 seq.)

Hug seems to take it for granted, that Paul had made a *second* visit to the Galatians, before he wrote his epistle to them. I do not see that this can be deduced, as he supposes, from the language employed by the apostle in Gal. 4: 13, *εὐαγγελισάμην ὑμῖν τὸ πρότερον*; for *πρότε-*

ρον means only a *time antecedent* to that in which he wrote, or (as we say in English) *formerly* or *in time past*. Paul then could express himself in this manner, whether he had made *one* or *two* visits to Galatia before he wrote his epistle.

On the other hand, when the apostle (in 1: 6), expresses his wonder that 'the Galatians had begun to depart from their primitive faith οὕτω ταχέως, *so soon*,' the most natural interpretation of this is, to refer it to *time* and not construe it as meaning *sine more*, i. e. *festinanter, prae-postere*, etc., as Schott proposes to do, Isagoge, § 53, Note 4.

To construe δι' ἀσθενειαν τῆς σαρκὸς εὐαγγελισάμην as relating to the *apostle's condescension to Jewish prejudices* when he first preached among them, is evidently overlooking the sense which the context puts upon these words; for the apostle proceeds to say: "Ye did not despise τὸν πειρασμὸν μου τὸν ἐν τῇ σαρκί μου," thus plainly shewing that it was some *physical* debility or hindrance which he had suffered, while labouring at first among the Galatians.

As to the fact, whether Paul actually wrote the epistle to the Galatians after his *second* visit to them, this has been assumed and defended by Eichhorn, Bertholdt, Winer, De Wette, and others, as well as by Hug. Such may, indeed, have been the case; and perhaps, considering the time naturally requisite for the changes that the Galatian churches had undergone in their sentiments, we may deem this to be the more probable supposition.

The disputes about the *chronology* exhibited in the contents of the epistle to the Galatians, which mentions Paul's visit to Jerusalem (1: 18. 2: 1), have been often repeated, and do not seem yet to be terminated. The reader may obtain hints which will enable him to understand the subject in dispute, by first of all acquiring a definite view of Paul's respective journeys to Jerusalem; which, as recorded in the Acts, he will find,

(1) In Acts 9: 26—28, (comp. Gal. 1: 18, 10.)

(2) In Acts 11: 27—30; which seems to have been a journey for mere *elemosynary* purposes, and probably took place, as the famine in the time of Claudius enables us to determine, in A. D. 44 or 45. This famine began in A. D. 44, toward the close of the fourth year of the reign of Claudius, Joseph. Antiq. XX. 5. 2. Kuinoel, Comm. on Acts 11: 28, and particularly his Proleg. p. XXV. Allowing now some time for the pressure of the famine, before it was severely felt, we may place this elemosynary journey of Paul near the close of A. D. 44, or in the beginning of A. D. 45.

(3) The *third* journey of Paul to Jerusalem was made by him as a delegate from the churches at Antioch to Jerusalem, in order to obtain the views of the apostles and elders at Jerusalem in regard to the necessity of circumcising Gentile converts; Acts 15: 1—30.

The question mainly disputed in regard to these matters is, how the *fourteen* years mentioned in Gal 2: 1 are to be counted. Those who reckon πάλιν here as meaning the *second* journey of Paul to Jerusalem, i. e. his *elemosynary* one (as stated above), are obliged, of course, to adopt a different reading of the Greek text, and instead of διὰ τεσσάρων ἐτῶν, to read διὰ τεσσάρων ἐτῶν, i. e. *after four years* (in-

stead of fourteen). So Capell, Grotius, Heinrichs, Bertholdt, and others. See Kuinoel in Proleg. ut supra. So also Schott thinks the text should be read. But here again the advocates of this reading are divided as to the method of making out the *four* years. (a) Some count it from and after the time when Paul made his first journey to Jerusalem; so that it would be seven years, or in the eighth year, after his conversion, when he made the eleemosynary journey; which may be made to tally with his conversion in A. D. 36 or 37. (b) Others date his conversion in A. D. 40, and then reckon the *four* years from that time, and not from the time of the first journey to Jerusalem. See Kuinoel ut supra, and the authors cited by him.

Differing widely from these, other writers, and of late nearly all the distinguished critics, suppose that the journey of Paul mentioned in Gal. 2: 1, *διὰ δεκατεσσάρων ἔτων*, must have been the one named under No. 3 above. So Irenaeus in ancient times, Adv. Haeret. III. 13. § 3; so Pearson in his Annales Paulini, Semler in his Paraph. in Gal.; Koppe, Comm. in Gal.; Vogel, Commentatio, etc., in Gabler's Journal. B. I. St. 2. Haselaar, de Nonnullis Actorum etc. 1806; C. Schmidt, Chronol. der Apostelgeschichte, in Keil and Tzschirner's Analecten, B. III. St. 1; Winer, in Excursus ad Comm. in Gal.; and Hensen in Leben Pauli. The two last have treated this matter in a way more perspicuous and satisfactory than even Hug has done, in § 82 seq. of his work. To them I must refer the reader for the detail of the various considerations which belong to the subject.

Some of those who have advocated the views mentioned in the paragraph which precedes the last, are Keil in his Opuscula; Eichhorn, Einleit. B. III.; Süskind, Neue Versuch über Chronologie, etc., in Bengel's Archiv, I.; Gabler, Neues theol. Journal, XIII.; Kückler, de Anno quo Paulus etc. 1828; Flatt, Comm. über die Galater; Kuinoel, Comm. in Act., Proleg.

I will add here, for the sake of furnishing the student with more materials of investigation, a brief statement in regard to the chronology of the *third* journey of Paul, i. e. the one made to attend the council at Jerusalem, as related in Acts xv.

Hug places this in A. D. 53 (p. 503). This would make the 14 years mentioned in Gal. 2: 1, to be dated from and after Paul's first Journey to Jerusalem in A. D. 39, as computed by Hug. The reader should be advertised, that the confidence with which he speaks on this subject is not altogether well grounded. He assumes, in order to make out his argument, that the martyrdom of James, the imprisonment of Peter, and the death of Herod Agrippa (Acts xii.), all happened while Paul and Barnabas were at Jerusalem, during their eleemosynary mission, Acts 11: 30. The time of the death of Agrippa is an important circumstance; for after his death, his son being a minor and unfit to conduct the affairs of government, the Roman emperor sent Cuspius Fadus as Procurator, and *under him the famine commenced which was predicted by Agabus*, Acts 9: 28. It seems plainly to have been the pressure occasioned by this, which sent Paul and Barnabas to Jerusalem on their eleemosynary errand.

Hug then, taking it for granted that the death of Agrippa happened while they were there, seems to feel that here is a definite stand-point;

for we know from Josephus (Antiq. XX. 5. 2), that Agrippa died *after* the third year of Claudius was completed, i. e. after January of A. D. 44, for Claudius ascended the throne in January of A. D. 41. Our author also represents Paul and Barnabas as going up to Jerusalem on their errand of charity, at the time when Peter was apprehended by Herod Agrippa. Yet the death of Agrippa did not follow until some time after this, viz. when he had gone to Cesarea. Hug states, on p. 495, that the famine *followed after* the decease of Agrippa (which we know from history to be true as stated above); and yet, in the paragraph next preceding, he represents Paul and Barnabas as having come to Jerusalem before the feast when Peter was apprehended by Herod, and of course before Herod's death, and therefore *before* the famine had begun to exist. Of course he must construe Acts 11: 29, 30, as referring to a charity-mission which *preceded* the famine; for which opinion, as I understand the text, no good reason can be given.

The whole basis of Hug's argument here seems to me to be assumption merely. How can we argue that there is an exact *synchronism* between the arrival, or at least the stay, of Paul and Barnabas at Jerusalem, and the events of James' death and Peter's apprehension and Herod's consequent death? All that the writer says to guide us is this: *κατ' ἐξέινον δὲ καιρόν κ. τ. λ.*, i. e. *about that time, near that time*. So far as this expression is concerned, it may indeed have been at the very time when the messengers from Antioch were at Jerusalem; or it may have been a little afterwards, or a little before. *Κατά* before a designation of *time*, is used in various senses: e. g. Matt. 27: 15, *κατὰ τὴν ἑορτήν*, *at the feast, during the feast*; Heb. 1: 10, *κατ' ἀρχάς*, *olim, in days of yore*; *κατὰ τὴν ἐπιούσαν ἡμέραν*, *to-morrow, on the coming day*, Jos. Antiq. VI. 5. 3. We are not limited, by the *language* of the historian, to the supposition that the events related in Acts XII. are strictly *synchronistic* with the visit of the messenger there from Antioch. Consequently the *circumstances of the case* are to guide us. But these appear to be conclusive against Hug's view. The messengers from Antioch come up to Jerusalem, in order to relieve (at least this seems to me to be the plain sense of the passage) the pressure of Christians there from a famine, which did not take place until some months after Herod's death; and yet our author brings them to Jerusalem *before* the death of Herod, and consequently before the famine had commenced. It appears to me, indeed, quite plain, that James' martyrdom, Peter's imprisonment, and Herod's death, had all taken place *before* Paul and Barnabas went on their eleemosynary errand, because no special occasion for such an errand existed, so far as we have any knowledge, until *after* Herod's death. This leaves us, then, to find the time of this errand only through the medium of the time when the famine happened, excepting that the *κατ' ἐξέινον καιρόν* of Acts 12: 1 advertises us, that the time of the visit could not have been far from the time of the other events just mentioned. But when we examine again into the history of the famine, in Jos. Antiq. XX. 5. 2, we find that it lasted from A. D. 44 (latter part) to some time in A. D. 46, i. e. some *two* or more years. How soon, or how late, during these years, did the church at Antioch send to the relief of their brethren at Jerusalem? This is a point which we have no means of deciding. Probable conjecture is all that we can



offer ; although the impression of the inexperienced reader, on perusing Hug (p. 494 seq.), would probably be quite different from this.

Another important point assumed by Hug as certain, or nearly so, is still attended with not a little difficulty. I refer to the period when Paul went, for the *third* time, to Jerusalem, to attend a council of the apostles and elders ; which Hug places in A. D. 53. This can hardly be made out with probability ; certainly not with any good degree of assurance. In Acts 18: 1, 2, long *after* the journey of Paul to attend the council at Jerusalem, we have the statement that the apostle met with Aquila and Priscilla, '*who had lately come from Italy*, because of the decree of Claudius, which excluded the Jews from Rome.' Now, although it cannot be shewn with entire certainty in what year of Claudius' reign this took place, yet it seems to be quite probable, that it was during the *twelfth* year, i. e. some time in A. D. 52. See Suetonius, Vita Claudii, c. 15. Tacit. Annal. 12. 52 ; see also Schott's Isagoge, § 48. Note 15, and the essays cited there. A considerable period must have been occupied by Paul, in making his journeys and performing his labours, as related in Acts xvi. xvii. What have we then, to guide us as to the time when the council at Jerusalem was held ? Nothing definite. Schott proposes (as some others have done, and as the Chronicon Alexandrinum does), to read Gal. 2: 1 thus: *διὰ τεσσαράρων ἐτῶν* ; and he supposes Paul's conversion to have happened in A. D. 40 or 41 ; then counting *three* years to his first journey to Jerusalem, and *four* years to the time when Paul went up to attend the council, he makes it of course to be held in A. D. 47 or 48. But here again critics are divided, and no firm ground has yet been won, on which we can stand with entire confidence. If we suppose that Paul was converted in A. D. 36, and then (with Pearson) count the 14 years of Gal. 2: 1 from the time of his *conversion*, we should of course have A. D. 50 for the time of the council and of the journey which the apostle mentions in Acts xv. This would accord well with the tenor of the history in Acts 18: 1, 2, as it would leave some two years for the events in Acts xvi. xvii. It appears by these two chapters, that Paul had traversed most parts of Asia Minor, and of the sea coast of eastern upper Greece, before he came to Corinth and found Aquila and Priscilla there. This was probably in A. D. 52. But we can only conjecture, after all, as to the actual time of the council at Jerusalem. Thus much, it would seem, must be true, if the reading *δεκατεσσαράρων* in Gal 2: 1 is retained, viz., that it was either 14 years after Paul's conversion, or 14 years after his first visit to Jerusalem, which was three years subsequent to his conversion. Yet even here we have not attained to all that we desire, as to the precise chronology. His conversion is placed in A. D. 33, 35, 36, 37, 40, 41, etc., with great confidence by different writers. On the whole, then, the student need not expect any thing more than some tolerable degree of satisfaction as to *probability* in any of these cases ; at least in the present stage of discussion. When critics speak about these matters with confidence, and as though certain and precise dates were absolutely made out, the reader must attribute this merely to the strength of the writer's conviction, and not to the *facts* which the case allows us, as yet, to consider as well established.

To return for a moment to the *time* when the epistle to the Galatians was itself written; I deem it not improbable that it was written not long after Paul's second visit to Ephesus (Acts 19: 1), where he staid three years (Acts 20: 21). His first visit is recorded in Acts 16: 6, when the Galatian church was founded. This second visit was *to confirm*, i. e. strengthen, encourage, render stable, the church there and in Phrygia, Acts 18: 23. Soon after his second visit Paul came to Ephesus, and staid there three years, Acts 19: 1. Now as nothing is hinted of the defection of the Galatians, when Paul made his second visit to them, but the same thing is said of Paul (*ἐπιστηρίζων*) both in respect to the churches of Phrygia and Galatia, it is very natural to conclude, that *after* his second visit there was a speedy and unexpected change among the Galatian churches, so that the *οὕτω ταχέως* of Gal. 1: 6, is altogether intelligible and apposite. Paul at Ephesus, the capital of Asia Minor, had good opportunity to learn the state of the Galatians, and leisure to write to them. Most probably, then, he did write here, and not long after his arrival, as *οὕτω ταχέως* would seem to indicate.

NOTE 31. *First Epistle to the Corinthians.* (§ 102 seq. p. 512 seq.)

The time and place of this epistle are so definitely given, that scarcely any doubt can remain on the mind of the reader. 1 Cor. 16: 8 shews us that the place was *Ephesus*; and 1 Cor. 16: 5 shews that it was written near the time of Paul's departure for Macedonia, as related in Acts 20: 1, 2.

---

NOTE 32. *Second Epistle to the Corinthians.* (§ 106 seq. p. 530 seq.)

There can be no doubt, when any one reads attentively the second epistle to the Corinthians, that it must have been written but a few months after the first, and written during the apostle's journey through Macedonia. It was somewhere in Macedonia, on this journey, that Titus met him with the tidings from Corinth, 2 Cor. 8: 5, 6; and the same Titus was sent back to Corinth with the second epistle, 2 Cor. 8: 11—18, 23. 9: 3—5. Whether *Philippi* was the place of writing it, or some other town, cannot be ascertained. See Henssen, p. 312.

Efforts have been made to divide this epistle into several, which were supposed to be written at different times. So Semler in his *Paraphrasis*, and Weber in his *Programma de numero Epist. ad Cor.*, etc. 1798. The reader may find the discussion in Schott's *Isag.*, § 57. The whole matter is so purely arbitrary, as hardly to merit a discussion.

NOTE 33. *First Epistle to Timothy.* (§ 109 seq. p. 534 seq.)

What Hug has said in defence of his views here, is certainly ingenious, and on the whole seems to me more probable than any other supposition, in regard to the time when this epistle was written. Theodoret, Benson, Zachariae, Michaelis, Hänlein, C. Schmidt, Koppe, H. Planck, A. Curtius in his *Comm. de Tempore quo prior ep. ad Tim. etc.* 1828, and others, are substantially of the same opinion with Hug. Hemsén has decided in the same way, and has given us a most able discussion of the subject; *Leben Pauli*, pp. 340 seq.

The difficulty which lies in the way seems to be, that in 2 Cor. 1: 1, (written after Paul left Ephesus and during his journeyings in Macedonia), the apostle joins Timothy with himself in the salutation; who, therefore, must have been present with him. But Hug has shewn that there is no very serious difficulty here; certainly nothing which is insuperable. The considerations, moreover, which are suggested in the epistle in relation to the appointment of bishops and deacons, and the various proposed arrangements of ecclesiastical matters, naturally point us to an *early* state of the Ephesian church. Schott (*Isag.* § 73, Note 3) suggests, that the mention of false teachers, the command that a teacher should not be a *novice*, and other circumstances of the like nature, shew that the Ephesian church could not have been *recently* established. But I do not feel the force of this argument. Paul had been preaching at Ephesus some *three* years before he left the place, and then he went away at the close of a great tumult. While he was there superintending the concerns of the churches in person, they were not in any special need of other pastors; but when he left the place, it was natural for him to wish that teachers and elders should be appointed, who now could no longer be considered as *νεόφυτοι*, provided they had been among the early converts.

Bertholdt supposes that Timothy had been sent to Ephesus by Paul, during his three months stay in Greece, i. e. in Corinth, after his journey from Ephesus through Macedonia, Acts 20: 1—3; and that the apostle wrote to him at Corinth, or at least on his return from Corinth to Asia. Berth. Einleit. VII. 3571. But Acts 20: 4 is decisive against this, inasmuch as Timothy was still with Paul on his return from Corinth to Asia Minor.

Finally, Usher, Pearson, Mill, Le Clerc, Wegscheider, Paley, Heydenreich, Guericke, and Böhl, decide in favour of a time which is *posterior* to the first imprisonment of Paul at Rome. Schott inclines to the same opinion, *Isag.* p. 298. Note 7; where the reader may find a summary of the reasons in favour of this view of the subject. I readily concede that there are some things in this view which in themselves seem not to be improbable. Indeed one is almost ready to hesitate between this view and the one given by Hug; but, on the whole, I am rather inclined to the latter; and the more so, because Hemsén (*Leben Pauli*, pp. 340—384) seems to have substantially answered the arguments adduced by the writers above named in favour of the late composition of this epistle. To him I refer the reader; who

will find in him a summary of all which is of any importance that has been advanced in relation to the topic before us, and a considerate estimation of its critical value.

NOTE 34. *Epistle to the Romans.* (§ 114 seq. p. 541 seq.)

I must refer the reader here for all which I could say in regard to the critical history of this epistle, to the introduction to my Commentary upon it. Of course the *time* in which it was written is differently dated, according to different views of chronology in respect to the life and actions of Paul. Hug places the writing of it in the *fifth* year of Nero; i. e. A. D. 59 or 60, (Nero's reign began in A. D. 54); Schott supposes it to be the latter part of A. D. 56 or the beginning of A. D. 57; while Hemsen places it in A. D. 60, and so Eichhorn, Tholuck, De Wette, and the majority of later critics.

Whoever wishes to see an ample and able discussion of all the critical doubts and difficulties that have been raised concerning this epistle, may consult Hemsen (ut supra) pp. 394—422. In particular, what is said about the order of the doxology in Rom. 16: 25—27; the order and genuineness of chap. xv. xvi., which have in various ways been assailed; is most amply and very ably discussed by Hemsen, in pp. 450—466. In regard to the difficulties now in question I have given a brief account in the commentary before named, and summarily discussed them. The reader would not be aware, from reading Hug only, that any of the difficulties in question had ever been raised. The theory of Schott in regard to chap. xv. xvi., in his *Isagoge* § 59, Note 3, (of which I have given an account in my work above named), is a most singular conceit of a very learned, and for the most part solid, sober, and judicious writer. Seldom will any author be met with, who has included more or as much valuable instruction in the same compass, as this author has done in his *Isagoge*. It is the more to be wondered at, therefore, that he should have fallen upon such a singular conceit about the last chapters of the epistle to the Romans.

NOTE 35. *Epistle to the Ephesians.* (§ 120 seq. p. 548 seq.)

Hug has stated, for substance, all the evidence from ancient times, that the so-called epistle to the *Ephesians* had not originally a specific direction given to it; at least that it was not directed principally or exclusively to the Ephesians. The conjecture of Usher, that it was an *encyclical* epistle, designed not only for Ephesus but for the churches in its neighborhood, has been more generally received than any other explanation of the difficulties respecting its original destination.



Hemsen (pp. 602 seq.), after adducing the facts which Hug has stated in regard to the testimony of Basil and Jerome, and also the opinion of Marcion, comes to the conclusion, that Paul originally had several copies of the epistle made out, in one of which he wrote ἐν Ἐφέσῳ in verse 1, in another ἐν Λαοδικείῃ, and in others still (which were designed for other churches where Tychicus the bearer of the epistle might go and carry a copy) he wrote τοῖς οὖσιν—and left a vacant space after it, so that Tychicus might fill it up as occasion would require. In this way, he supposes, we may account for the readings in *Ephesus*, in *Laodicea*, and also for Codices which omit both. All are but various ways of reading, which are equally correct and original.

I cannot well rest in such a conclusion; although, indeed, it is substantially that of Hug, p. 551. Other encyclical epistles, e. g. 1 Pet. 2 Pet., James, leave no vacant space in the inscription to be filled up. Nor does it seem very probable that Paul would have sent his letter abroad in this condition. Did he not know to what churches he meant to send it? Was it likely that a prisoner at Rome urged every day with the great business of building up a church in the metropolis of the Roman empire, would attend to the multiplication of the copies of this epistle, when he could have this done indefinitely by a request to the church or churches to which it was to be sent? All this seems to me to be too improbable to be readily believed.

How then shall the omission of ἐν Ἐφέσῳ be explained, in the copies of which Basil speaks and to which he makes an appeal? A question which it may be difficult to answer; and yet one that does not establish the position which it is designed to establish.

Several things may be taken into consideration here, in the way of preparation for some answer to this question. It is a common remark, that there is almost nothing of allusion in this epistle to any *personal* connection of the writer with those whom he addresses. He does not here speak, as he does in the epistles to the Corinthians, Galatians, Thessalonians, etc., of intimate connection with them, of his state of mind towards them, of theirs towards him; of false teachers or false doctrines among them, which he foretold would come in upon them, when he parted with the elders of this church at Miletus, Acts 20: 17 seq. Inasmuch as Paul had spent almost three years at Ephesus, we should expect to find every where in his letter, it is said, an overflowing of heart, a paternal tenderness and affection, which would characterize this above all of his epistles. But instead of this, we find him speaking in a very cool and distant manner: "After I had heard of your faith in the Lord Jesus and love to all the saints" (1: 15); just as if he knew nothing of this matter except by *hearsay*. Then again, in 3: 2, 3, he says: "If ye have heard of the dispensation of the grace of God which is given me to you ward, how that by revelation he made known unto me the the mystery, as I wrote afore in a few words." And then in v. 4 he goes on to say, that 'in case they have read that letter they may understand his knowledge of the mystery of Christ.' Again, in 4: 20, 21, he speaks of the Ephesians as not having learned Christ in a carnal manner, "if indeed they had heard and been taught in respect to him, as the truth was in Jesus." How is it possible, now, it is asked, to suppose that the apostle could speak in this manner to a church, which he had

founded in person, and to which he preached about the space of three years?

Such is the sum of the argument against the alleged direction of the epistle before us to the Ephesian church. Most of its force, however, depends on a single particle, viz. *εἴγε*, which seems to be wrongly understood by many, and erroneously translated in our English version. This particle, although a conditional one, yet does not seem, by N. Test. usage, to imply *doubt* or *uncertainty* in respect to the conditional sentiment which it precedes. E. g. 2 Cor. 5: 3, *εἴγε καὶ ἐνδυσάμενοι*, "since in case we are [thus] clothed, we shall not be found naked, etc." Gal. 3: 4, "Have ye suffered so much in vain? *εἴγε καὶ εἰς αὐτήν*, since it is indeed in vain," i. e. it is so, in case ye have apostatized, as is reported. In Col. 1: 23, we have *εἴγε ἐπιμένετε κ. τ. λ.*, i. e. "in case ye shall continue rooted and grounded in the faith." That they would persevere, the apostle did not doubt, and did not mean to express a doubt.

These are all the cases of *εἴγε* in the New Testament excepting the two before us, in Eph. 3: 2 and 4: 11. In the first of these, the sentiment appears to be the following: "Since ye know the dispensation of the grace of God which is given me *εἰς ὑμᾶς*, that he revealed to me the mystery; (as I before wrote you briefly, which when you read, you can consider (*νοῆσαι*) my acquaintance with the mystery of Christ)." Now there is one circumstance here, which seems to me to overthrow the whole design for which this passage is quoted, in order to show that Paul could not have directed this epistle to the Ephesians. It is the *εἰς ὑμᾶς* which he throws into it. What can this mean, but that the mystery of the gospel entrusted to him, had been specially developed by him to them. If you say: 'This was by the former letter which he here mentions'; my answer is, that he only adverts to that as a summary (*ἐν ὀλίγῳ*) of what he had preached, and the use to be made of it is, to supply them with an aid to reflection or consideration in regard to what he had preached. What could be more natural? The apostle had been now absent from them some six or seven years. Can we suppose that he had never written to them? He tells us plainly here that he had; and that in that writing he had exhibited a summary of the mystery of the gospel, the dispensation of which had been committed to him *εἰς ὑμᾶς on their account*. We find no evidence here then of *strangeness* and distance on the part of the writer, but first a dispensing of the grace of the gospel to them, and secondly of a familiar and friendly epistle to them before the one which the author is now writing.

The second *εἴγε* is still less in favour of those, who appeal to it for the purpose already named. What says the apostle? "But you have not so learned Christ; *since (εἴγε)* ye have heard him [i. e. Christian doctrine], and been taught by him (or in respect to him, *ἐν αὐτῷ*), as the truth is in Jesus;" Eph. 4: 20, 21. Here the assertion of the apostle is absolute, that the Ephesians have not erroneously learned Christ; and this, says he, must be so, since they had heard and been taught as the truth is in Jesus.

These supposed *conditionalities*, then, make no good ground of argument for those whom I am now opposing. Nor does the *ἀκούσας* of 1: 15 serve any better purpose. Why should we understand this of the apostle's merely and originally learning something of the faith and love

of the Ephesian church by *hearsay*? Had he not been absent from them some *six* years when he wrote the epistle before us? How could he know whether they persevered in their faith and love, except by *hearsay*? And what could be more natural than for him to inquire solicitously respecting their condition?

These alleged *internal* evidences, then, that Paul could not have written this epistle to the *Ephesians*, seem to melt away before closer scrutiny. Let us see, now, what there is of a different tenor, in this epistle.

The reader must open his New Testament and read for himself attentively Eph. 1: 1—14. 2: 1—10, 3: 1, 13—21. He is desired specially to note 3: 13, “my tribulation *for you*, which is *your* glory.” 4: 1—3, 17—24. 6: 10—24. Are *strangers* merely addressed here? I acknowledge that there is less *circumstantiality* here, than in the epistles to the Corinthians, to the Galatians, and to some other churches. But there is an obvious reason for this. Those epistles were written shortly after the apostle had been with the respective churches; and nothing was more natural in such a case than *circumstantiality*. But here, an absence of some *six* years had made quite a difference in respect to this. Many were dead whom the apostle personally knew; and others had been joined to the church to whom he was *personally* unknown.

Taking all this into consideration, in connection with the unanimous testimony of all the Mss. now extant, and all the ancient versions, there can scarcely be room for much doubt, that ἐν Ἐφεσῶν in chapter 1: 1 is genuine, and that it stands properly there. How can we prescribe for Paul, the particular *manner* in which he should address any church to which he writes, and then make our preconceived notions on this subject, the measure of our critical judgment?

The reader should not fail to notice the remarkable similarity which exists between the tenor of this epistle and that to the Colossians. Let him compare, for example,

(a)	Eph. 1: 4—12, 19—23 2: 14—22. 3: 6, 9—12. 4: 15 seq.	Col. 1: 13—20, 24 seq. 2: 9—15.
(b)	2: 1—12.	1: 21 seq.
(c)	4: 22 seq.	3: 9, 10.
(e)	5: 21—33. 6: 1—9.	3: 18—25. 4: 1.
(d)	5: 18 seq.	3: 16 seq.
(f)	4: 29.	4: 5, 6.
(g)	6: 18 seq.	4: 2 seq.
(h)	6: 21 seq.	4: 7 seq.

These are only a small part of the whole resemblances. A similar junction of sentences and the like phraseology may be found in abundance. I refer the reader, for the tabular exhibition of this, to De Wette's Einleit. ins N. Test. § 146; also to a brief but well digested summary of the whole, in Schott's Isagoge, § 62, Notes 4—13. One can hardly refrain from coming to the conclusion, that both epistles must have been written near the same time, and while the writer's mind was substantially in the same attitude.

NOTE 36. *Epistle to the Colossians.* (§ 123 seq. p. 552 seq.)

The introduction to this epistle by Hug, seems at first to be meagre. The difficult and interesting questions concerning it he does not discuss here. But the reader will find more respecting some of them in § 131.

It is singular, that he, Hemsén, Bähr, and others, should appeal to Eckhel (*Doctrina Nummorum*, III. p. 147), as confirming the orthography *Κολοσσαί*, instead of *Κολασσαί*; while Schott and De Wette make the same appeal, in order to prove that the *latter* is the true orthography. Critical editors are divided on the question which is the best orthography. In the mean time, as the Roman and Greek writers employ the *O* in the name (and not the *A*), this would seem to settle the question which is preferable.

Hug assumes the fact (p. 553), that Paul had not taught *in person* at Colosse. I cannot either assume it, or (on the whole) even think it to be very probable. In Acts 16: 6 we have an account of Paul's traversing the country of *Phrygia*, in which was Colosse and Laodicea, near together, and both at a moderate distance from Ephesus. Again in Acts 18: 23 is another narration of the same kind. It is indeed no where actually specified, that Paul visited Colosse or Laodicea. But I do not understand Col. 2: 1, as deciding against the supposition that Paul had been at Colosse; as many do. Theodoret of old gave it as his opinion, that "those who had not seen the face" of the apostle, were others not included among the Christians of Colosse and Laodicea. So Lardner, Schott, Hemsén, and others; while De Wette, Bähr, and others, side with Hug. I cannot think it probable, that Paul, during his three years' stay at Ephesus, would not have visited Colosse and Laodicea, which were so nearly within his neighborhood. Be that as it may, however, the apostle speaks in a tone of such affectionate confidence to the Colossians, as almost of necessity imports some personal acquaintance; unless indeed he had told us expressly to the contrary, which he has not.

That Epaphras, however, had been the principal instrument in building up the Colossian church, is plainly indicated by Col. 1: 7. 4: 12, 13.

The principal occasion of the epistle to the Colossians, seems to have been the rise of certain heretical teachers and fanatics among them, as described in chap. II. Who and what these were, has been a question which has given rise to much discussion and a great variety of opinion. Different critics have found in them Gnostics, Essenes, precursors of Montanism, disciples of John the Baptist, Jewish Cabbalists, and Judaizing Christians; and some a sect compounded of several of these. That the sect in question were professed Christians, but still heretical ones, would seem to be implied by 2: 19, οὐ κρατῶν τὴν κεφαλὴν κ. τ. λ. The apostle's description of them is brief and graphic. They were men, who, pretending to be philosophers, taught "vain deceit, the traditions of men, the rudiments of the world," and not true Christian doctrine. They were men who had over much zeal about 'meats and drinks, holidays, new-moons, and [Jewish] sabbaths' (2: 16); they were devoted to a kind of "angel-worship," and pretended



to a 'secret knowledge of the invisible world (*ἃ μὴ ὥρακεν ἑμβρατέων*, 2: 18); they made much of mere external ordinances, which had respect only to the perishing objects of sense; they made a great shew of humility, of rigid abstinences, of macerating the body, etc.; yet still they were vainly puffed up with overweening conceit respecting their own superior virtue and intelligence; Col. 2: 20—23, comp. v. 18. Such is the brief but animated description, which the apostle has given of the heresy that disturbed the peace and threatened the purity of the church at Colosse.

Two circumstances attending the exhibition of this subject serve to shew, that many of the conjectures respecting the sect to which these false teachers belonged, are not well grounded. It is plain, in the first place, when we attentively examine Col. 2: 18—23, that the errorists in question pretended to be Christians as has already been remarked; and in the second place, that the church at Colosse were in danger of being influenced by them, on account of their unusual pretences or claims to humility, self-denial, and especially to a deep and recondite knowledge of invisible and supernatural things; *ἃ μὴ ὥρακεν ἑμβρατέων*, v. 18. Now all this could not belong to disciples of John the Baptist, to Gnostics, Jewish Cabbalists, or Essenes, simply as such. It might indeed be true, that some professed Christians had something of a Gnostic faith, or of Cabbalistic fancy, or were inclined to the ascetics of the Essenes; but so far as any part of this seemed to savour of these respective sects, it would rather diminish than enhance their credit among the Colossian Christians in general; and of course diminish the danger to which the church was exposed by reason of them.

The sect in question, (if *sect* they must be named), would rather appear to have been one who maintained doctrines compounded of the oriental emanation-philosophy and some of the speculative part of Platonism, a kind of theosophico-ascetic philosophy. The emanation-philosophy taught the derivation of many orders of beings of different rank, first from the great Supreme, and then in succession from each other. To become capable of union with these, ascetic practices and abstraction to all possible extent from every thing material and sensual, was deemed necessary. A philosophy of this kind had not only reached Asia Minor, but penetrated even to Rome, before the time of Augustus; see Hensen, pp. 203 seq. 642 seq. Much of this philosophy some of the professed converts to Christianity might have still retained; and it would seem from the epistle to Titus, Timothy, and to the Colossians, that they did retain it. Hence the dignity of Christ and his high exaltation over all these *αἰῶνες* (Aeons) are so strenuously inculcated in the epistle before us. This seems to be the most natural and easy solution of the difficulties that have been raised as to the contents of this epistle. The reader will find a very able and learned statement of this subject, in the sequel of Hug, viz. in §§ 131—133.

As to the dispute respecting *the epistle to the Laodiceans* (§ 127), Hug is clearly in the right, as it seems to me, when he comes to the conclusion, that the epistle to the *Colossians* was not occasioned by one from the Laodiceans to Paul, as some argue from (Col. 4: 16); nor was the epistle directed to the Colossians an answer to that Laodicean epis-

tle. But the conclusion of Hug and Hensen that the epistle to the *Laodiceans* was our present canonical epistle to the Ephesians, seems not to be equally well grounded. Their main reason is, that we cannot account for the loss of the epistle to the Laodiceans; and we must therefore suppose that it has been preserved, and consequently that we have it in the present epistle to the Ephesians. But how shall we account for the loss of Paul's first epistle to the Corinthians, 1 Cor. 5: 9? Or for the loss of his first epistle to the Ephesians, 3: 3? Or of an epistle by John, 3 John v. 9? And so, perhaps, of still more. Why should we plunge into greater difficulties in order to avoid less ones? It is easier to suppose the epistle to the Laodiceans to have been lost, than it is to account for it that Paul calls the epistle to the Ephesians by that name in Col. 4: 16.

Lastly, the *time* and *place* of writing the epistle to the Colossians have recently been called in question. The Coptic version gives *Athens* as the place of writing it; Erasmus conjectured that *Ephesus* was the place. But both are contradicted by Col. 4: 3, 18, which shews that the writer was in *bonds*. Oeder conjectured that it was written during some imprisonment previous to that at Rome; and Paulus, during Paul's imprisonment at Cesarea. But the circumstances of the case, the society of Demas, Tychicus, Onesimus, etc., at *Rome*, adverted to in Col. 4: 7 seq., point very clearly to the *Romish* imprisonment, and not to that of Cesarea, where none of these persons seem to have been.

The recent works on this epistle, or containing critical discussions respecting it, are Boehmer, *Isagoge in epist. ad Coloss.* 1829. Bähr, *Comm. in Col.* 1833. Hensen, *Leben Pauli*, 1830. D. Schulz, in *Studien und Kritiken*, II. p. 535 seq. F. Junker, *Histor. Crit. und Philol. Comm. über die Coloss.* 1828. Schneckenburger, in *Anhang zur Proselytentaufe*.

#### NOTE 37. *Epistle to Philemon.* (§ 127. p. 555).

Hug has said nothing of the place where probably was the residence of Philemon. It appears from Col. 4: 9, that Onesimus belonged to Colosse. It would seem, therefore, of course, that his master also lived there; and Theodoret says, that in his time the house of Philemon was standing there, *Comm. in Philem.*

It has been a question, *where* Onesimus was converted to the Christian faith. Some have maintained that it was at Colosse; others, at Ephesus; others, at Rome. Nothing certain can be made out respecting this point. But Philem. v. 19 appears to me plainly to intimate, that Philemon himself had been converted under the preaching or instruction of Paul; and this would seem to increase the probability that Paul had himself been at Colosse.

That the epistles to the Ephesians and Colossians, and also to Philemon, were written about the same time, and sent away by the same messenger, viz. Tychicus, appears from comparing Eph. 6: 21, 22 and Col. 4: 7, 9. As Onesimus was in company with him, he would therefore most naturally carry the letter addressed to his master.

NOTE 38. *Second Epistle to Timothy.* (§ 128 seq. p. 556 seq.)

The circumstance on which Hug, De Wette, and others seem to rely, in order to prove that the second epistle to Timothy was written *before* the epistles to the Philippians, Colossians, and Philemon, and *after* that to the Ephesians, viz. that Timothy was not joined with the apostle in his salutation prefixed to the latter epistle, and therefore was not come to Rome when 2 Tim. was written (4: 9), while he is mentioned in the salutation of all the other epistles written during Paul's imprisonment, does not seem to me to be a conclusive argument. Timothy was an accredited messenger and friend of Paul, who was continually making visits to different churches, agreeably to the directions of the apostle. The circumstance of his being *present* or *absent*, therefore, as developed in any particular epistle of Paul written during his imprisonment for two years and upwards, can never fully decide any thing as to the particular order in which the epistles were written.

The question whether the *second* epistle to Timothy was written during the *first* or a *second* imprisonment of Paul at Rome, is one that has been long and vigorously contested, and is not yet brought to a close. Baronius, Witsius, Lightfoot, Hammond, Zachariae, Schmidt, Hug, Hensen, and others, contend for the *first*; while Mosheim, Michaelis, Bertholdt, Mynster, Heydenreich, Guerike, Böhl, Usher, Benson, Mill, Le Clerc, Paley, and others, contend for the *second*.

Hug (p. 556) has produced some striking examples of the presence or society of several individuals with Paul when he wrote the second epistle to Timothy, who were with him in his first imprisonment; so striking that they seem, at first view, almost to forbid the idea, that there could have been another time, i. e. a *second* imprisonment, when all these circumstances would have so concurred.

But he has not given a full view (in § 129) of the difficulties that lie in the way of his supposition. Nor has he removed in a satisfactory manner those which he has mentioned. E. g. he says that the declaration of Paul, that *Erastus stayed* (ἔμεινε) *in Corinth* (where he belonged, see Rom. 16: 23), does not import that the apostle *left* him there, but only that he had not come to Rome where he was expected. But this phraseology (ἔμεινε) would be so singular and unnatural to express such a sentiment, that it cannot be so interpreted without doing violence to the usual principles of language.

Then again: "Trophimus ἀπέλιπον at Miletus sick." Who left him there? *They*, says Hug; and he appeals to the form of the verb, which may be either the first person singular, or the third person plural. But who

are *they*? Hug does not tell us, excepting that he suggests the custom of the churches in sending messengers to aid those churches, and specially those apostles, who were suffering from persecution. But as nothing is suggested in the context which would supply us with a subject of the verb in the *third person plural*, so we are led naturally and of course to construe ἀπέλιπον in the *first person singular*, and consequently to apply it to Paul. But when could Paul have gone to Miletus? Certainly not when he sailed from Cesarea to Rome as a prisoner; for the course taken by the ship in which he was embarked, leads of necessity to this conclusion. The only time which the history of Paul mentions his being at Miletus, was during his last journey from Greece to Jerusalem (Acts 20: 15 seq.) which was some five years before he wrote his second epistle to Timothy, even according to the chronology of Hug and Hensen. How could it be to Paul's purpose, when he urges Timothy to come to him immediately because other helpers failed, to say that some five years or more before this, he had left one helper at Corinth, and another at Miletus? The only natural supposition in this case is, that Paul, not long before his arrival at Rome, had parted with both of these friends; and of course this must import that there had been another circuit made by him in the performance of his evangelical labours, of which the book of Acts gives us no account, and which must have been after his first imprisonment. It could not have been during his journey from Corinth to Jerusalem; for it appears by Acts 21: 29, that Trophimus was with Paul at Jerusalem.

With this agrees 2 Tim. 4: 13. 'Bring my cloak left at Troas, and the books, and the parchments.' Had all these then been there for the space of more than five years, and Paul had not needed or not remembered them? Did he want for opportunity to send for them, when he was two years at Cesarea? To suppose a mandate of this kind, after so long an intervening period, is at least highly improbable.

Other historical difficulties exist. In 2 Tim. 4: 12, Tychicus is mentioned as being sent away by Paul to Ephesus; in Col. 4: 7, 8, he is spoken of as about to be sent with the letter to the Colossians to carry which he would of course land at Ephesus. Yet Hug places the 2 Tim. *before* the epistle to the Colossians.

Again; in 2 Tim. 4: 10, Demas is mentioned as having forsaken Paul, through love of the world; in Col. 4: 14 Demas is mentioned as being present with Paul, and joining with Luke in salutations to the Colossians; all in opposition to the views of Hug.

Once more; the civil process against Paul appears to be far advanced (2 Tim. 4: 16), and he has no expectation of escape from death (2 Tim. 4: 6); whereas during his first imprisonment, he expresses the joyful and confident expectation that he shall be liberated, and soon be with the church at Philippi, Phil. 1: 24—26. 2: 24; and again in Philem. v. 22, he directs his friend to prepare lodgings, which might be ready against the visit which Paul intended to make to Colosse.

There are other minute circumstances of difficulty. In Rom. 16: 3, Paul, writing at Corinth just before his journey from there to Jerusalem when he was apprehended, mentions Priscilla and Aquila as being at Corinth; while in 2 Tim. 4: 19 Timothy is directed to salute them at *Ephesus*. In 2 Tim. 4: 10, only Luke and Mark are mentioned togeth-



er as being with Paul; while in Acts 27: 2, Aristarchus is mentioned as a companion of Paul on his journey to Rome, and again he is mentioned as being with Paul at Rome in Col. 4: 10 and in Philem. v. 24, in both which cases Mark and Luke also are mentioned.

On the whole, therefore, it seems to me much easier to suppose the presence with Paul of the persons mentioned by Hug, on p. 556, during a *second* captivity, than to dispose of the difficulties which have been mentioned. Add to all this that Eusebius, Chrysostom, Theodoret, and others of the ancients, gave full credit to the liberation of Paul from his *first* imprisonment. There is, moreover, a passage in Clemens Romanus, who must have known the fact whether Paul was liberated or not, which implies that he went into Spain, i. e. to the pillars of Hercules. His words are: *δικαιοσύνην διδάξας ὅλον τὸν κόσμον, καὶ ἐπὶ τὸ τέλος τῆς δούσεως ἐλθὼν κ. τ. λ.* Ep. ad Cor. c. 5. To construe *τὸ τέλος τῆς δούσεως* of *Illyricum*, as mentioned in Rom. 15: 19, as Hensen does (p. 710), seems to be doing violence to the plain and obvious meaning of the expression of Clemens.

If these suggestions are well grounded, then has Hug given an erroneous place to the epistle to Timothy. At all events it would seem necessary to put it *after* the epistles to the Philippians, Colossians, and Philemon; as the suggestions above will serve to shew.

The *literature* in regard to this subject, may be found in Bertholdt, Heydenreich, Guerike, Böhl, Schott, and specially in Hensen, in their works already often cited. Schott has given a very judicious and well composed summary of the whole.

NOTE 39. *Epistle to the Philippians.* (§ 138 seq. p. 577 seq.)

Oeder supposes this epistle to have been written during the apostle's troubles at Corinth; which needs no refutation. Paulus conjectures that it must have been written during Paul's imprisonment at *Cesarea*. Rheinwald in his *Comm. über die Philipper*, Heinrichs in his *Comm.*, and Mynster in his *Kleine theol. Schritten*, have sufficiently refuted this.

Heinrichs and some others have made the conjecture, that our present epistle to the Philippians consists of two different epistles; the first of I.—III. 1 and 4: 21—23; and the second of the rest of the epistle. Schott has sufficiently answered the arguments adduced in favour of this conjecture; *Isagoge*, § 70, Note 2.

NOTE 40. *Epistle to the Hebrews.* (§ 141 seq. p. 578 seq.)

As I have written so fully on the much controverted subject of the authorship of this epistle, in the introduction to my commentary upon it, it would be mere repetition for me to insert any thing more in this place respecting the subject. The current has for some time past been setting strong in Germany, against the *Pauline* origin of this epistle. The

late work of Bleek upon it has helped to deepen and render more rapid this current. Yet I cannot help the feeling, that it would not be difficult to prove almost any thing from antiquity, if one may take the liberties in logic which Bleek takes. The internal arguments, on which he so much relies, can be made equally strong in regard to Paul's *pastoral* epistles; and, so far as *ἅπαξ λεγόμενα* are concerned, or peculiarities in choice or use of words and phrases, equally strong in regard to almost any other of his epistles. When will it be understood that Paul was no tame and lifeless repeater of the same words and phrases, no plagiarist, no mere imitator, not even of himself? When this is well understood, much less reliance will be placed on arguments of this nature.

As to the proper *historical* evidence, it seems to me to be plainly, and (I had almost said) immeasurably, on the side of the Pauline origin, during the early period of the church. Where in all the Greek churches is even a solitary voice against such an origin?

If Eusebius in one place reckons it among the *ἀντιλεγόμενοι*, it plainly seems to be only in reference to the doubts which had been raised by some in the occidental region of the church. He says, that *there are FOURTEEN epistles, which are manifestly and certainly Paul's, τοῦ δὲ Παύλου πρόδηλοι καὶ σαφεῖς αἱ δεκατεσσαυαίς*, Hist. Ecc. III. 3. Of course we must include the epistle to the Hebrews in order to make out the number *fourteen*.

Nothing can shew the general state of the opinion in the East relative to this matter, down to the time of Eusebius, more definitely and certainly than this testimony. Every one who has read this writer knows, that he is very candid and careful as to the mentioning of different opinions respecting such matters, when he has any knowledge that they exist.

But while the current has of late been setting so strongly in the main against the *Pauline* origin of the epistle to the Hebrews, some vigorous efforts have been called forth on the other side. Storr, in his *Comm. über die Hebräer*; Meyer, in *Ammon and Bertholdt's Krit. Journal* II. B. 3 St.; De Groot, *Disputatio qua Ep. ad Heb. cum Paulinis epistolis comparatur*, 1826; Steudel, in *Bengel's Archiv* IV. B.; and some others, have defended the Pauline origin. But Schulz, Seyffarth, De Wette, Bleek, Schott, and almost all the late critical writers, have either actually opposed this sentiment, or shewn that they did not admit the correctness of it.

Recently Olshausen has published an Essay in his Latin *Opuscula*, which deserves very attentive perusal. He admits, on the whole, that the *Pauline* origin is to be doubted, or rather, that we cannot well decide in favour of it. But the object of his essay is, to shew what an unfair estimate has been put upon the arguments adduced to establish the *antipauline* theory, and how much more has been assumed than can be made out by proof. I can only express my wonder, that this was not long ago seen by him and by many others. Whatever may be the fact in regard to the real author of this epistle, nothing can be more certain in my mind, than that the great majority of the arguments employed to establish the antipauline theory, are entirely destitute of any real force. Indeed I scarcely know of any one subject in criticism, which has

seemed to me to have been more abused. I would hope that the sober and candid appeal of Olshausen may do something to arrest the current of opinion in relation to this matter, so far as this has been influenced by considerations which will not bear the test of well-grounded historical criticism.

In truth it seems more and more evident to me, that the *historical* doubts raised respecting this epistle, would never have gained much ground in recent times, had they not been aided and influenced very much by the tone and manner of the epistle. And yet this is a subject about which we cannot be very certain, so long as there are so many evident and confessed resemblances of thought, expression, and style in it, to the other epistles of Paul. Schleiermacher and Eichhorn have urged the same objections against the Pauline origin of the epistles to Timothy and Titus; and with apparently as good reason. Yet these objections have not been generally deemed to be of any considerable weight.

Dr. Bloomfield, in the second edition of his Comm. on the New Testament, has acceded only in part to the views of those who deny the authorship of Paul. He supposes that some intimate friend of Paul, acquainted with his sentiments and style, wrote it, and that Paul then gave it his sanction. In this way, he thinks, that both opinions may be harmonized, and the epistle at the same time preserved. This opinion was for substance advanced by Origen. The *thoughts*, he said, were those of the apostle; the *words* or *diction* might belong to Luke or some other person. Yet Origen speaks of the epistle as Paul's in a multitude of places; and indeed his views did not forbid him so to do, nor was it even an inconsistency in him.

That the thing supposed by Dr. Bloomfield may possibly have taken place, I surely would not deny. That we have definite and satisfactory evidence of it, I must doubt. While I acknowledge very freely, that there is, in many respects, an apparent discrepancy between the style of this epistle and that of Paul's acknowledged epistles, yet I doubt whether this can be made to appear as being any greater, than exists between Paul's *pastoral* and his other epistles.

The reader will find a summary of the *antipauline* arguments, in the Isagoge of Schott, and in the Einleit. of De Wette.

---

NOTE 41. *Epistle of James.* (§ 155 seq. p. 611 seq.)

The remarks made upon the *local* circumstances of the writer, in § 155, are striking, yet obvious; but they shew only that he lived in a country where the circumstances mentioned actually existed. It does not follow from any necessity of the case, that this country was *Palestine*; for the same circumstances existed elsewhere. Still, the general tenor of the epistle would speak in favour of its being written from Palestine. From what other quarter was a writer so likely to be heard with deference by all Jewish Christians, as from this? Or where else

could he seem to stand in so influential a relation to "the twelve tribes scattered abroad?"

On the subject of § 158 it may be remarked, that there is scarcely any certainty to be attained in relation to this disputed point. The *first* James, i. e. the brother of John and son of Zebedee, is admitted by nearly all to be out of question, on account of his early death; Acts XII. The subject of dispute is, whether James the son of Alpheus, son of Mary the sister of Jesus' mother, is the author of the epistle; or whether it is a James, a real brother by the mother's side, or brother in law, to Jesus, i. e. a son of Joseph by another marriage.

The difficulty is occasioned by the indefinite use of the word ἀδελφός in Hebrew-Greek, and the word אח in Hebrew; inasmuch as either of these words may mean *brother* in the strict sense, and also *cousin*, i. e. a near male relative. The *brethren* of Jesus are mentioned in Matt. 13: 55 and Mark 6: 3, by the Jews who undertake to apologize for their unbelief; and again they are mentioned in Acts 1: 14 and 1 Cor. 9: 5. In Acts 1: 14 and in Matt. 12: 46, 47, the mention of them stands immediately connected with the mention of Mary, the mother of Jesus, and seems plainly to import that they belong to her family. In Gal. 1: 19, James the *Lord's brother* is mentioned by name.

It is objected to the opinion, that the James mentioned as an *apostle* (not the son of Zebedee), Matt. 10: 3. Mark 3: 18. Luke 6: 15. Acts 1: 13, was in the strict sense the brother of our Lord, (1) That he is there reckoned as the *son of Alpheus*. (2) That the brethren of Jesus did not believe on him; John 7: 5. (3) That the brethren of Jesus, who however appear at a later period to have become believers, are still distinguished from the apostles, Acts 1: 14. (4) That an appellative, ἀδελφός τοῦ κυρίου (Gal. 1: 19), would not be in place, nor agreeable to common usage, if it meant no more than a *cousin*; and therefore, that the cases in which this appellation is given, must be distinguished from those in which James the son of Alpheus is mentioned, and another person be meant.

In accordance with this view, Grotius, Hammond, R. Simon, Herder, Niemeyer, Zachariae, Tholuck, Fritsche, De Wette, and others, suppose the James mentioned in Gal. 1: 19. 2: 9, and who appears to have had a high standing, yea a leading influence at Jerusalem (Acts 12: 17. 15: 13. 21: 18), was not an *apostle*, in the appropriate sense of this word, but in a strict sense the brother of Jesus.

On the other hand, many others, indeed the majority, hold that *James the son of Alpheus* and *James the brother of the Lord*, are one and the same person. So Calov, Buddaeus, Wolfius, Pritius, Carpzov, Semler, Rosenmüller, Pott, Storr, Augusti, Winer, Gabler, Haenlein, Eichhorn, Bertholdt, Hug, Schott, and many others. These appeal to the latitude of the word *brother* in Hebrew, in vindication of their opinion.

It appears from Josephus (Antiq. XX. 9. 1), that after the death of Festus, James, an ἀδελφός κυρίου was murdered by procurement of the then high-priest, Ananus; see Hug, § 164. De Wette, § 163, Note *d*. This must have been about A. D. 64. The James who was the proper brother of our Lord, or the James the son of Alpheus who was his *cousin*, might either of them, so far as respects any thing that we know



respecting the length of time in which they lived, have been the author of the epistle before us.

The general feeling has, as we have seen, set strongly in favour of regarding the *apostle* the son of Alpheus, as the author of this epistle or exhortation. But a proper brother of Jesus, who stood in such credit among all Christians, as we have seen above, might write an epistle of good authority; why not, as well as Mark or Luke could write a *Gospel*? The question is not very important, in my apprehension, to which of the two individuals the epistle belongs, to whom it has, by different writers, been attributed. Past experience would hardly encourage us to expect, that this question will be definitely settled.

The reader will perceive, that the early testimony respecting the epistle of James, which is deduced from the most ancient fathers, is comparatively meagre. Two passages in Athenagoras, an early father, deserve notice, although the reference to James in them may not be altogether certain: viz. *ὡς γὰρ ὁ γεωργὸς καταβάλλων εἰς γῆν τὰ σπέρματα, ἄμνητον περιμένει οὐκ ἐπισπείρων κ. τ. λ.*, comp. James 5: 7. Athenag. Leg. pro Christ. p. 37. So the following: *οὐ γὰρ μελέτη λόγων, ἀλλ' ἐπιδείξει καὶ διδασκαλεία ἔργων τὰ ἡμέτερα*, comp. James 3: 13.

It would be useless to appeal to testimonies in the fourth century; as they may be found in every quarter, and no doubt remains of its general reception at this period.

In the mean time, the remark of De Wette, who is uncommonly watchful for every matter of doubt, on the expression of Origen quoted in Note 3, p. 623, viz. *ὡς ἐν τῇ φερομένῃ Ἰακώβου*, seems to have no good foundation. De Wette appeals to the word *φερομένη*, as designating a *doubt* in the mind of Origen, whether this epistle in reality belongs to James, inasmuch as he seems to say, that it is only *reported* (*φερομένη*) to be his. But this word is not by any means used among the Christian fathers, so as necessarily to convey merely such an idea. Eusebius, in Hist. Ecc. III. 25, employs the same word in speaking of the first epistle of John, which, however, he expressly reckons among the *ὁμολογούμενα* or uncontradicted writings of the New Testament.

One obvious reason may be suggested, why the epistle of James is no more frequently quoted by the ancients; this is, that it is made up mostly of mere hortatory and practical matter. Another reason, perhaps, had some influence, viz. that it *seems* to contradict some of the positions which Paul had taken in regard to the matter of justification by faith.

For this latter reason, perhaps, Erasmus entertained doubts respecting its authenticity; Annot. in Jac. At any rate, Luther, in his Preface to this epistle, assigns this reason, and stoutly maintains that it is well grounded: "Sie stracks wider St. Paulum und alle andere Schrift den Werken die Gerechtigkeit gibt," i. e. 'it ascribes justification to works, directly contrary to St. Paul and all other Scripture.' So in his Preface to his New Testament, he says: "St. Jacobs Epistel ist eine rechte stroherne Epistel," i. e. 'St James epistle is a downwright strawy epistle.'—So too judged Andrew Althammer, and the Magdeburg Centurionators; all for the same reason, viz. because James contradicts *Luther's*

views of justification ; for that he contradicts Paul's views, can never be made out.

The reader who wishes to investigate this last point, is referred to a dissertation upon it in Dr. Knapp's *Scripta varii Argumenti*, translated and printed in the *Bib. Repository*, III. p. 189 seq. Also a more able and satisfactory dissertation by C. Fromann, translated and printed in the *Bib. Repository*, IV. p. 683. In my *Comm. on the Romans*, in an *Excursus on Rom. 3: 28*, I have also endeavored to shew that the two apostles are altogether harmonious with each other. Hug, in § 166, exhibits a brief discussion of the subject ; but it is hardly ample or able enough to remove the difficulties which he has stated without due caution, (for so it seems to me), in § 157.

As to the style and diction of this epistle, they are remarkably discrepant from all other writings of the New Testament. There is less of proper Hebraism than usual. An *oratorical* and even a *poetic* manner belongs to its characteristics. Let the reader consider particularly the whole tone of address, and the manner of composition in 1: 14—18. 3: 5—9. 5: 1—6. The whole epistle is a most vivid piece, fraught with feeling, bold in manner, and unsparing in reproof ; and yet very affectionate, tender, and well adapted to win its readers.

Although it is peculiarly *sui generis* in respect to style and manner, it still exhibits evidence of an intimate acquaintance and familiarity with the writings of Paul and Peter. Let the reader compare, for example,

James 1: 3 with Rom. 5: 3.	James 4: 4 with Rom. 8: 7.
1: 6 . . . 4: 14.	4: 12 . . . 14: 4.

The similarity of tone with that of Peter, is still more striking ; compare,

James 1: 2, 3 with 1 Pet 1: 6, 7. 4: 12, 13. James 1: 21 with Pet. 2: 1, 2.	
1: 10, 11 . . . 1: 24.	4: 10 . . . 5: 6.
1: 18 . . . 1: 3, 23.	5: 20 . . . 4: 8.

Even the *Pauline* diction is frequent ; e. g. *δικαιοῦσθαι πίστει ἐκ πίστεως*—ἐξ ἔργων ; *πρῶτον* followed by *εἶτα*, *κτίσμα θεοῦ*, *ψυχικός*, etc.

Yet with all this, no writer in the New Testament is more entirely peculiar than the author of this epistle.

The writers on this epistle are very numerous. I shall point out only a few of the more valuable. Benson's *Commentary* on it is worthy of consultation. Morus has some good suggestions in his *Praelectiones in Jacobum*. J. J. Hottinger, in *Epist. Jacobi*, 1815, may be consulted with some profit. A. R. Gebser, *Der Brief. Jacobi*, is the most copious and able commentator who has recently appeared. J. Sculthess has written a *Commentarius copiosissimus* upon it, 1823, and is a shrewd and sometimes powerful writer, but is wanting in judgment and accuracy. The latest work, I believe, is that of Theile ; which I have not seen. Pott, in *Nov. Test. Koppianum*, is worthy of attention.

*As to the literature*, it may be found in Storr, Diss. Exeget. in Epist. Jacobi, in his Opusc. Vol. II. Schulz, Der schriftstellerische Character und Werth des Petrus, Judas, und Jacobus, 1802. Gierig, De Virtutibus Epist. Jacobi, 1782. Rauch, Ueber den Brief Jacobi, in Winer and Engelhardt's Neues Krit. Journal, B. VI. St. 3.

In the sequel, Hug, in his remarks on the first epistle of Peter, has exhibited some valuable thoughts with regard to the similarity of James' epistle, in some respects, to that of Peter, and also in regard to the confirmation of the authenticity of the epistle of James by the latter apostle.

NOTE 42. *First Epistle of Peter.* (§ 167 seq. p. 628 seq.)

The genuineness of this epistle has scarcely ever been questioned. The doubts suggested by Cludius, in his Uransichten des Christenthums, 1808, have been fully solved by Augusti in his Nova Hypothesis, quæ primæ Petri epistolæ ἀνθεντιαν impugnat, sub examen vocatur, 1808. De Wette has also, as usual, suggested some doubts in his Einleitung; which have been replied to by Guericke in his Beiträge, etc.

Rauch, Schott, and others, agree that the συνεκλεκτή in 1 Pet. 5: 13 means the *wife* of Peter; as Hug notices in § 172. That it means some *person*, seems altogether probable; as the reader will see if he attends to the connection in the sequel—καὶ Μάρκος ὁ υἱὸς μου. The latter has recently been taken for Peter's own proper son.

That Babylon in *Egypt* is meant, in 5: 13, is possible; but clearly not probable. That *mystical* Babylon, i. e. Rome, is meant, is still less probable. Mystical names of this kind, in a prosaic epistle, consisting merely of plain and hortatory matter, are not to be expected, and can not be admitted without strong reasons.

As to the *time* when this epistle was written, I have found nothing better than what Hug has suggested in § 170. That Peter was at *Babylon*, when he wrote this epistle, is no serious objection to his being afterwards at Rome, and suffering martyrdom there; which the general voice of antiquity asserts. Nor can the fact of his being at Babylon and writing to the Christians of Asia Minor during the Neronic persecution, be any proof, that during the same persecution he did not become a martyr at Rome.

In the mean time, it is not at all certain that the sufferings of Christians as described in Peter's first epistle, were those occasioned by Nero's persecution. Every where did the unbelieving Jews hate and persecute the believing ones, and try to render them suspected and odious to the Roman magistracy. There is nothing of this nature in the first epistle of Peter, so far as I can see, which might not be explained satisfactorily on this ground. Let the reader compare 2 Thess. 1: 4—10. 3: 2.

NOTE 42. *Second Epistle of Peter.* (§ 173 seq. p. 636 seq.)

Hug assumes it as a fact, that Peter had written to the churches in Asia Minor an epistle by Sylvanus, which is now lost. I cannot find in the words of 1 Pet. 5: 12 any thing to justify this assumption. *Δι' ὁλίγων ἔγραψα* may well refer to the so-called first epistle of Peter, as it now stands in the canon of the New Testament. And if the second epistle of Peter is genuine, then does 2 Pet. 3: 1 stand in direct opposition to Hug's assumption; and indeed, even on the ground that the second epistle is by another hand, the passage just referred to shews, that the writer knew of but one epistle of Peter to the churches in question.

The similarity between 2 Pet. and the epistle of Jude is much greater than Hug has represented it to be. Let the reader compare the following passages throughout; viz.,

2 Pet. 1: 1, 2	Jude v. 1, 2.	2 Pet. 2: 11	Jude v. 9.
1: 5	— 3.	2: 12	— 10.
1: 12, 13, 15		2: 15	— 11.
2: 1—3	— 4, 5.	2: 13	— 12.
2: 4	— 6.	2: 17	— 13.
2: 6, 10	— 7.	2: 18	— 16.
2: 10	— 8.	3: 1—3	— 17, 18.

In both epistles, viz. the 2 Pet. and Jude, the inscription seems to be *general*. But this proves nothing definite. The epistle to the Hebrews and the first of John have no inscriptions; yet both were sent to particular churches, or rather, perhaps, to the churches of a particular region. The contents of each make this quite certain. And so in the present case. The first epistle of Peter is inscribed "to the dispersion [i. e. Jews scattered] in Asia Minor." In the 2d of Pet. 3: 2 there is a recognition of having written a *first* epistle to those whom he now addresses again. In *Jude* this indeed does not occur. But from the similarity of circumstances mentioned in this epistle, with those noted in the 2d of Peter, it seems highly probable that churches of the same region, and infested with the same errors, were addressed.

As to the question laboured by Hug, De Wette, and others, *whether Peter copied from Jude, or Jude from Peter*, it is one which can never be determined with any good degree of certainty; nor even whether either *copied* from the other. With all their near resemblances to each other, there are many striking traits of discrepancy, which the critical reader can easily make out for himself. We have seen, in the case of James, that he has many resemblances to Paul in his diction and phraseology; and also that he has as many and still more striking ones to the first of Peter. Yet was he no copyist. Nothing can be more original or *sui generis* than his epistle. Why then may not Paul and Jude be both original, in the like sense with James? It does indeed seem probable to me, that Peter had read the epistle to Jude, when he wrote



his second epistle, and that the thoughts and diction had made a strong impression upon his mind. But is it not equally clear that the writer of the Apocalypse had read Ezekiel, Daniel, and Zechariah, and that he every where presents diction and imagery seemingly borrowed from these books? Yet who would venture to call in question the *originality* of the Apocalypse? It is as strongly marked as that of any book of Scripture.

Peter and Jude, being both *apostles*, must have been very intimately acquainted. Both in all probability had laboured among those churches, or at least among some of them, to whom their epistles were addressed. On the supposition that they had met together during their missionary labours, and conferred together respecting the state of the churches which they had visited, and had both fully and freely spoken out their feelings and views, (all of which no one can well deem improbable), nothing could be more natural than that they should both have written in the like way, respecting the false teachers who were creeping in. Supposing, moreover, that Jude wrote his epistle *first* (which seems quite probable), and that Peter had a copy of it in his hands, and had just read it when he sat down to write his own, nothing could be more natural than the expression of his feelings in respect to the false teachers, in a way altogether like that of Jude. Both epistles together, when they so plainly aimed at the same errors, were adapted to produce a strong impression.

De Wette of course has his difficulties. (1) 'The use of another's writing is unseemly for an apostle.' But the assumption that Peter did *copy* from Jude, is not altogether clear and certain, as he supposes; and this for the reasons suggested above. Then again, supposing that there are many striking resemblances (which I freely concede), yet, as we have seen, the epistle of James and the Apocalypse have full claim to originality and peculiarity, notwithstanding the like traits. But,

(2) 'The inscriptions are not definite.' So indeed it is; but where are the inscriptions to the epistle to the Hebrews and to the first epistle of John? (3) 'The author of 2 Pet. is too anxious to show his apostleship. 2 Pet. 1: 1, 14, 16, 18. 3: 2.' But let the reader turn to the first of Cor., Gal., and other epistles of Paul, even to his *pastoral* ones, and then say whether Paul has not exhibited still greater solicitude on this point. The assertion of *apostolic* authority became necessary in many cases, in order to remove the impressions in regard to it which false teachers had made. (4) 'The writer appeals to Paul's epistles, 3: 15.' True, he does; and why should he not? Paul had written to some churches in Asia, and it would seem that his epistles had been treated as *encyclical*, from the nature of the appeal here made. What valid objection can there be to Peter's referring to the declarations and instructions of Paul, the great acknowledged apostle of the Gentiles, and of the Jews also who lived among them? But, (5) 'The epistle refers to doubts about the coming of Christ, 3: 8 seq.' Undoubtedly it does. But what if any in the churches addressed by it, had interpreted some of Paul's writings as the Thessalonian churches did, i. e. as indicating an *immediate* coming of Christ; and then, as this did not take place according to their expectation, they began to indulge doubts respecting the whole subject? Was any thing more natural than this, in respect to

such a class of persons? And was it strange that Peter should oppose such doubts, when they took such a turn as to threaten more general skepticism?

Last but not least, De Wette urges 'the want of ancient testimony in favour of the *Petrine* origin of this epistle.' Still he has given the testimony in its favour more fully than Hug; and the reader may find it spread out in Lardner or Schmid. It seems to be as well supported, in this respect, as the epistle of James; better than the 2d and 3d epistles of John.

Against the Petrine origin, however, some writers of great note have declared themselves: viz., Calvin, Erasmus, Grotius, J. C. Chr. Schmidt, Welcker, Guericke, and (in a modified way) Eichhorn and Ullmann. For the Petrine origin have contended Pott, Augusti, Dahl, Schmid, E. C. Flatt, Hug, Bertholdt, and recently Olshausen, in a modified sense. The candid and valuable essay of the last named author on this subject is being translated by the Editor of the Bib. Repository, and will soon appear in that work.

Those among the ancient writers who assign reasons for putting this epistle among the *ἀντιλεγόμενοις*, say that *the style is so discrepant from that of the first epistle of Peter* as to have occasioned this. But this ground depends so much on a matter of taste, and oftentimes on mere first impressions of readers who have not made any minute investigation, that it is always to be admitted with caution. It would be easy, as a matter of fact, to produce many strong resemblances between 1st of Pet. and 2d of Peter.

It has been urged against the genuineness of 2d of Peter, that chap. 2: 1 speaks of false teachers who are yet *future*, while that of Jude speaks of them as having already arisen, v. 4. But this is said without due consideration. In the sequel of chap. 11., Peter also speaks of these teachers as having already come, and as exercising a pernicious influence. Who can read the prophecies of the Old Testament without recognizing the fact, that almost every where the prophets shift from the future to the present, and from the present to the past? Even so it is in regard to the past and present in the historical books; not in the Scriptures only, but also in other and heathen writers. How can any one, who is familiar with prophetic writings, suggest such an objection as this? Let him look at the tenor of the Apocalypse.

Besides; as to matter of fact, had not teachers already arisen, and would they not continue to develop themselves still more in future? Why should it be strange that the language of the apostle, then, should have respect both to the present and to the future?

NOTE 43. *Epistle of Jude.* (§ 180 seq. p. 645 seq.)

I do not regard what Hug has said in § 181, as by any means conclusive in regard to the *Jude* who was the author of the epistle so named in our Canon. In Matt. 13: 55 and Mark 6: 3, James and Jude are

mentioned in connection with Mary the mother of Jesus, as being the *brethren* of our Lord. From the connection, moreover, in which the passage here stands, I cannot resist the impression, that his own proper brethren according to the flesh are meant. But is this Jude the only one, who is named as a brother of a person who is called James? I think not. In a catalogue of the names of the apostles in Luke 6: 16 and Acts 1: 13, we find mention of *Ἰούδας Ἰακώβου*. The question here is, whether the ellipsis in this case is to be filled up with *νίός* or with *ἀδελγός*. Jessien (de authentia epist. Judae), De Wette, Hug, and others, defend *νίός*; but our English version supplies *brother*; and Winer (N. Test. Gramm. p. 160, ed. 3) strongly defends this. He produces *Τιμοκράτης ὁ Μητροδώρου*, sc. *ἀδελγός*, from Alciphron Ep. 2: 2. Clearly this method of filling up the ellipsis is neither impossible nor improbable. The only serious ground of doubt arises from what is implied in the suggestion: 'Why did not the writer, in each of these cases, mention Jude along with *Ἰακώβος Ἀλφαίου*, if he were his brother?' I acknowledge that this creates some embarrassment. Still, that the general impression among the ancients was, that Jude was an *apostle*, seems plain from the fact, that they often call him so; e. g. Origen (Comm. in Epist. ad Rom. IV. p. 549), "*Judas apostolus* in epistola catholica dicit." So in his *De Principiis*, III. 2. I. 138, "meminit in epistola sua *apostolus* Judas." So Tertullian (de Habit. Fem. c. 3), "apud Judam *apostolum* testimonium possidet."

Schott, whose deliberate opinion on a subject of this nature is worthy of high regard, thinks that the Jude who was the author of this epistle was neither a brother of James the son of Alphaeus, nor of James the Lord's brother, but probably the Jude mentioned in Acts 15: 22, 27, 32, 33, who was a man in great credit and a *prophet*, Acts 15: 32. He is inclined to believe that Jude the author of the epistle, was a son of Zebedee, and a brother of James the elder and John. According to Acts 15: 22, the Judas there mentioned was also called *Barsabas*, i. e. the son of Sabas or Zabas; which he supposes may be an abridged form of the name Zebedee, as Lucas is of Lucanus, Silas of Silvanus, etc. He assigns, moreover, as a reason for this supposition, that *Ἰουδᾶς Ἰακώβου ἀδελγός* (Jude v. 1) must be designed to point out some James preeminent in the church and well known among Christians in general.

This opinion is defended also by Welcker, in his philol. exeget. Clavis, p. 157. It bids fair to make as good a claim as the one advanced by Hug.

The argument, however, adduced by Hug and others against the *apostleship* of Jude, because he calls himself merely *Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ δοῦλος*, amounts to nothing. Does not Paul do the same, in Phil. 1: 1? And does he not omit both *δοῦλος* and *ἀπόστολος* in 1 Thess., 2 Thess., and Philemon? Does not James call himself simply *δοῦλος* in 1: 1, and John *πρεσβύτερος* in 2 John and 3 John? Nothing important can be deduced from such circumstances.

Much has been said on the *quotation*, as it is called, from the book of Enoch, in Jude v. 14. A book of this name has recently been obtained in Ethiopia, and an English version of it published by Dr. Lau-

rence, who labours to prove its great antiquity. To my own mind his arguments are not satisfactory. He seems to take it for granted, that Jude has actually quoted from this book; and consequently, that the book must be as old as the times of the apostles. But I regard this argument as merely specious. Why could not Jude quote a *traditional saying*, as well as a book, the truth and importance of which was generally acknowledged? And why could not the author of the book of Enoch have transcribed this saying, as exhibited by Jude, or taken it as Jude did from tradition, if he wrote after the apostolic age? The coincidence of some passages between the epistle of Jude and the book of Enoch, can prove nothing as to which book was anterior, while tradition is sufficient to account for the passage in either.

I cannot resist the persuasion that comes upon me, from reading the book of Enoch, that the writer was a *theosophic* Jewish Christian, acquainted in some small measure with the doctrine of the Logos, but deeply immersed in the emanation-philosophy of the East, and striving to make a kind of compound of some things in Judaism, some in Christianity, and more still in the Gnostic oriental philosophy. I am not at all satisfied, therefore, with Dr. Laurence's argument, although learned and ingenious, to prove the great antiquity of the book of Enoch.

But even if it is ancient, and Jude has quoted from it, I do not see how this will destroy (as many have supposed) the authenticity of Jude's epistle. Could not a work of this nature comprise some things which were well founded and true? From what or whom does the apostle quote in Eph. 5: 14? From whom in 2 Tim. 2: 19, in 1 Tim 4: 8, and 2 Tim. 2: 11 seq.?

As to the subject of Satan's dispute with Michael respecting the *body of Moses*, I apprehend that we must ever fail of giving a satisfactory solution of this passage, until we know something more of the tradition current in the apostle's day in regard to this subject. To those who believe in angelic guardianship and interposition in the affairs of men, the obscurity or difficulty of this subject will present nothing which is very formidable; certainly nothing to shake their faith, or move them to a general skepticism.

The evidence is so strong and so ancient in regard to the early existence and genuineness of this epistle, that few sober critics are disposed to call it in question.

#### NOTE 44. *The Apocalypse.* (§ 184. p. 650.)

The exhibition of the ancient testimonies in favour of the genuineness and authenticity of this book, as made by Hug, is striking, and, as it seems to me, conclusive so far as testimony of this kind can go. The reader may find them more at large in Lardner and in Schmid. The latter wrote and published a learned dissertation on this subject, the title of which is given by Hug, p. 652, Note 3. In the *Historia antiq. et Vindiciæ Canonis*, etc., § 198 seq., he has given the substance



of this very learned and able discussion, and replied to many of the objections made against the Apocalypse.

In almost all commentators on this book, especially in Eichhorn, Michaelis, Bengel, Herrenschneder, Harenberg, Herder (in his *Maranatha*), Lange, Heinrichs, Ewald, Matthaei, Vitranga, Lücke, and others, the reader will find more or less in relation to this subject. In the *introductions* to the New Testament writings, such as Haenlein, Bertholdt, Eichhorn, Schott, De Wette, and others, he will of course find it discussed. Among all these, Frederic Lücke, in his recent work on the Apocalypse, has most of all distinguished himself for copiousness and extent of investigation. In general, there is a spirit of candour and moderation in his criticisms; although I cannot by any means subscribe to all the positions which he advances.

One of the most recent works on this book, is J. M. A. Scholz, *die Apokalypsis Johannis erklärt*, 1828; which I have not seen. Important hints and discussions of various highly interesting questions, may be found in Bleek, *Beiträge zur Kritik der Offenbarung Johannis*, in the *Zeitschrift of Schleiermacher*, De Wette, and Lücke, B. II. p. 253 seq. Steudel, *Ueber die richtige Auffassungsweise der Apokalypse*, Bengel's Archiv. IV. 2. Lücke, *Apokaluptische Studien*, in the *Studien and Kritiken* by him and others, II. 2. p. 304. Also in Vogel, *Comm. de Apocalypsi*, Part. I—VII. 1811—1816.

The testimony of Justin Martyr, of Irenaeus, of Tertullian, Origen, and Cyprian, is so direct and full, as to the Apocalypse being from the pen of the apostle John, that we can hardly find any one book of the New Testament better supported in this respect. Indeed, the most recent opposers of the apostolic origin of this book, such as Schott and Lücke, concede that the *external* evidence is against them. Their judgment, therefore, is founded on what they deem to be *internal* evidence.

De Wette, although strongly opposed to admitting it to be a work of the apostle John, still very candidly admits, that the opposition of the so-called Alogi and of Caius of Rome arose rather from their *Antimon-tanism*, than from critical reasons. Down to the time of Dionysius of Alexandria, then, i. e. until about A. D. 247, the genuineness of the book remains uncontradicted by any respectable authority.

In modern times, the opposition to the genuineness and even to the authenticity of the Apocalypse has been in many cases very strenuous. Luther seems to have led the van. In the Preface to his Apocalypse, 1552, he has assigned his reasons for rejecting it from the Canon. They are very curious, and deserve a moment's attention.

(1) "The apostles do not concern themselves with *visions*; neither does Christ in the Gospels. Nor does any prophet even of the Old Testament exhibit them throughout his work."

But what book of the New Testament is *prophetic*, as a whole, or even in any considerable degree, except the Apocalypse? And as to the Old Testament, had Luther not read Ezekiel, Daniel, and Zechariah?

(2) "The writer of the Apocalypse claims a great deal too much for his book. He who takes from it is to have his part in the book of life taken away: and he who adds to it, is to bring on himself all the

plagues threatened in it. This he should not have said, inasmuch as he has written so unintelligibly that no one can make out what *holding to his book* means; and then there are many other more edifying and important books than this."

But if the writer was truly inspired, it was not inconsistent for him to denounce the rejection of his testimony. As to the *obscurity* of his book, does that lie in the book itself, or in us? And is our measure of knowledge a proper test of the origin of a book? Luther's *last* reason, however, which doubtless was the most substantial one in his own mind, is more curious still;

(3) "Let any one obtain from this book what his spirit enables him to do. *My mind cannot accommodate itself to the book*; and it is reason enough for me not to respect it, that Christ is neither taught in it, nor acknowledged; which above all things an apostle is bound to do, for Christ says in Acts i., *Ye shall be my witnesses*. I remain, therefore, by the books which give Christ to me clearly and purely."

But why then cannot a doubter in divine revelation in general, or in any particular part of it, plead that his mind cannot accommodate itself to such disclosures? On this ground, indeed, Schulz throws away Matthew, Schleiermacher Luke, Bretschneider and others John, Eichhorn the pastoral epistles of Paul, and Luther James. Where shall we end with such arguments?—Then, as to Christ being found in the Apocalypse, it seems to me, that of all the books in the New Testament this is preeminent in this respect. Christ is the beginning, middle, and end of it; the soul and body, the centre and substance of the whole. His glory, his triumphs, his reign, his kingdom, is all in all.

Luther's example, as we might suppose, emboldened many others to walk in his steps. J. D. Michaelis, Oeder, Stroth, Semler, Merkel, Corrodi, Heinrichs, Cludius, Ewald, De Wette, Schott, Lücke, Bleek, and others, have, in different ways and with various gradations of sentiment, assailed or called in question either the genuineness or the authenticity, or both, of this book. At the same time it has not wanted defenders. C. F. Schmidt, Reuss, Knittel, Lüdenwald, Augusti, Hartwich, Storr, Haenlein, Schmidt, Eichhorn, Hug, Bertholdt, Müller, Guericke, and others, have examined and replied to the allegations made against it.

No book in the New Testament has found so many opposers as this; and, what seems to be equally plain, no book has been so much misunderstood and misinterpreted. Nothing can be more evident to an attentive reader of the Hebrew prophets, especially of Ezekiel, Daniel, and Zechariah, than that this book is altogether in the like strain with them. It is indeed and truly—*POETRY*; I mean that, although it is not *measure* nor *parallelism*, yet it is throughout, in its essence, in its very life and soul, Hebrew poetic imagery and symbols.

On this ground I do not feel the force of most of the internal arguments against its genuineness, drawn from a comparison of it with the Gospel and Epistles of John. How can we suppose, that simple narrative and affectionate epistolary address should occasion the writer always to move in the same element which is appropriate to *prophetic* inspiration? That there are, after all, many most striking resemblances of

thought and diction between the Apocalypse and the acknowledged works of John, no candid critic will deny. This we might naturally expect. But that the discrepancies of diction and manner, in a work so entirely different from any of his other ones, should be urged as a strong argument against the authorship of John, does not seem to me to savour of impartiality or of sober and candid judgment.

From the simple statement of the nature of the Apocalypse it appears quite evident, that an interpreter of it must be qualified by a deep and attentive study of the Hebrew prophets, in order to explain with any good success the language of the book. The entire failure of a host of commentators on this book, to command public respect and interest for their efforts, has arisen in many cases, no doubt, from almost or quite an entire want of adequate philological preparation. Not, indeed, that this is all which is needed; but it is at least a *sine qua non*, in respect to the interpretation of such a book as this.

As this book, however, has lately attracted so much attention, and the interest in it is apparently on the increase, may we not hope that ere long we shall have something besides mere theory and surmises and conjectures to rest upon? Eichhorn has done much to explain the *diction*. His commentary on this book will be considered, I apprehend, by judges of after-time, as his best work. Yet there are parts of his theory of explanation which are almost revolting, at least altogether incredible. Still this does not obscure, at least it does not extinguish, his merit as an interpreter of words and phrases. He has certainly done much to be commended in this respect; and his book, with some *caveats* against his now and then visionary or indefensible positions, if laid before our religious public, might do much to check the progress of extravagant speculation and conjecture on the part of those who are not guided or aided by philology, and help to instruct readers as to some proper views of the nature of the diction and of the representations which John employs.





# CONTENTS.

## PART I.

### CHAPTER I.

#### AGE AND GENUINENESS OF THE WRITINGS OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.

	PAGE.
§ 1. Importance of these books in general . . . . .	9
2. Number of these books . . . . .	12
3. Genuineness of them. Internal proofs of the genuineness of the <i>historical books</i> . . . . .	12
4. Continuation. Proof of their genuineness from geographical circumstances . . . . .	16
5. Internal proofs of the genuineness of the <i>didactic writings</i> .	
6. External proofs. Citations from the N. T. in the writings of the heretics of the 2d century . . . . .	28
7. Observations on the procedure of the most ancient Christian writers in respect to biblical citations . . . . .	29
8. Celsus . . . . .	31
Tatian and Julius Cassian . . . . .	33
Theodotus . . . . .	37
Certain anonymous heretics . . . . .	43
Marcion . . . . .	44
Ptolomæus and Heracleon . . . . .	53
Valentinus and his school . . . . .	57
The Ebionites . . . . .	62
Basilides and Isidorus . . . . .	62

### CHAPTER II.

#### *Remarks in respect to the credibility of these writings.*

9. Credibility of the Gospel . . . . .	64
10. Credibility of the Acts of the Apostles . . . . .	66

### CHAPTER III.

#### *Writing-materials.—Publication.—Loss of the autographs.—Collection of the books.—The canon.*

11. Writing-materials . . . . .	66
12. Publication . . . . .	67
13. Continuation . . . . .	68
14. Loss of the autographs . . . . .	68
15. Continuation . . . . .	70
16. Collection of the books . . . . .	71
17. Continuation . . . . .	73
18. Canon . . . . .	74
19. Canon of the anonymous writer in Muratori. Canon of the Syriac church . . . . .	76

	PAGE.
§ 20. Canon of Eusebius . . . . .	78
21. Canon after the time of Nicene Council . . . . .	84

## CHAPTER IV.

*History of the Text. First period.*

22. Κοινή ἔκδοσις; vulgaris editio . . . . .	85
23. Proof that the Cambridge Ms. D. is a copy of the κοινή ἔκδοσις . . . . .	88
24. Origin of the changes which took place in the text of the Gospels during the first period . . . . .	90
25. Continuation. Readings in the margin of the Philoxenian version . . . . .	94
26. Κοινή ἔκδοσις in Syria . . . . .	96
27. The most ancient Latin versions are monuments of the κοινή ἔκδοσις . . . . .	98
28. Continuation . . . . .	100
29. Continuation . . . . .	101
30. Κοινή ἔκδοσις of the Acts of the Apostles . . . . .	104
31. Character of this text . . . . .	106
32. Κοινή ἔκδοσις of the Pauline Epistles . . . . .	108
33. Character of this text . . . . .	112
34. Κοινή ἔκδοσις of the Catholic Epistles . . . . .	114
35. Κοινή ἔκδοσις of the Apocalypse. History of the text. Second Period . . . . .	114
36. Recension of the text . . . . .	115
37. Recension of Hesychius . . . . .	119
38. Recension of Lucian . . . . .	122
39. Recension of Origen. History of the text. Third Period . . . . .	131
40. Origin of new corruptions of the text . . . . .	139

## CHAPTER V.

*History of the less important alterations which have taken place in the books of the N. T.*

41. Writing-materials . . . . .	142
42. Hand . . . . .	143
43. Interpunction . . . . .	144
44. Stichometry . . . . .	147
45. Origin of interpunction from stichometry . . . . .	149
46. Accents . . . . .	150
47. Superscriptions and subscriptions . . . . .	150
48. Divisions of the N. T. . . . .	153

## CHAPTER VI.

*Concerning the Mss.*

49. Determination of the age of Mss. . . . .	156
50. Mss. before the existence of stichometry . . . . .	158
51. Stichometrical Mss. . . . .	165

	PAGE.
§ 52. Mss. later than stichometry . . . . .	173
53. Remarkable Mss. in the cursive character . . . . .	178

## CHAPTER VII.

*Editions of the N. T.*

54. Earliest attempts in relation to the Gr. text of the N. T.	180
55. The Bible of Alcalá, and the editions of Erasmus . . . . .	181
56. The editions of Asulanus and Robert Stephens . . . . .	182
57. Reprints of these editions . . . . .	185
58. The editions of Beza and the Elzevirs . . . . .	187
59. The N. T. of the London Polyglot; the editions of Fell and Mill . . . . .	190
60. The editions of Bengel, Wetstein, Griesbach, Matthæi, Alter, and Birch . . . . .	193

## CHAPTER VIII.

*Versions of the N. T.*

61. Value of the versions. Syriac versions . . . . .	199
62. The Peschito . . . . .	200
63. Source of this version . . . . .	201
64. Its contents . . . . .	202
65. Continuation . . . . .	204
66. Continuation . . . . .	206
67. Character of the text . . . . .	208
68. Its antiquity . . . . .	209
69. Editions . . . . .	211
70. Philoxenian version. Its name and history . . . . .	217
71. Continuation . . . . .	217
72. Revision of it by Thomas of Charkel . . . . .	218
73. Continuation . . . . .	219
74. Continuation . . . . .	219
75. Continuation . . . . .	220
76. Text exhibited in this version . . . . .	221
77. Character of the version . . . . .	223
78. Edition . . . . .	224
79. Palaestino-Syriac version . . . . .	224
80. Source of it . . . . .	225
81. Persian version . . . . .	226
82. Source of it . . . . .	226
83. Its character . . . . .	227
84. Editions . . . . .	228
85. Armenian version. Its history . . . . .	229
86. Continuation . . . . .	229
87. Component parts of the text . . . . .	230
88. Alterations of this version according to the Latin . . . . .	231
89. Editions . . . . .	232
90. Egyptian versions. Coptic language . . . . .	232
91. Antiquity of these versions . . . . .	233
92. Dialect of the Coptic language . . . . .	237

	PAGE.
§ 93. Lower-Egyptian version . . . . .	237
94. Upper-Egyptian . . . . .	238
95. Nature of its text. Antiquity . . . . .	239
96. Third, or Bashmurian version . . . . .	241
97. Ethiopic version. Its history . . . . .	244
98. Nature of its text . . . . .	246
99. ARABIC VERSIONS. Their origin . . . . .	247
100. Latino-Arabic version . . . . .	247
101. Arabic version from the Syriac. The Acts of the Apostles, the Pauline and Catholic Epistles in the edition of Erpenius . . . . .	248
102. Doubts respecting the existence of a Syriaco-Arabic version of the Gospels . . . . .	250
103. Arabic version from the Coptic . . . . .	252
104. Further investigation of the Gospels in particular . . . . .	254
105. History of the text of these Gospels . . . . .	256
106. Editions of the Gospels . . . . .	257
107. Version from the Greek . . . . .	258
108. Arabic Acts of the Apostles, Epistles and Apocalypse in the Polyglots . . . . .	259
109. Nature of this version . . . . .	261
110. The country of its origin . . . . .	262
111. Text . . . . .	262
112. Some other editions . . . . .	263
113. LATIN VERSIONS. Variety of them before the time of Jerome . . . . .	264
114. Time when these versions originated . . . . .	265
115. The <i>Itala</i> . . . . .	266
116. Source of these versions . . . . .	268
117. Their fortunes . . . . .	268
118. Jerome's emendation . . . . .	269
119. Fortunes of this emendation . . . . .	271
120. New corruptions of the Mss. of the Lat. versions . . . . .	272
121. Alcuin's emendation . . . . .	272
122. Continuation . . . . .	273
123. Continuation . . . . .	273
124. Continuation . . . . .	276
125. Emendation by Lanfranc. Correctoria . . . . .	277
126. Decree of the Council of Trent . . . . .	279
127. Sixtine edition of the Vulgate . . . . .	280
128. Clementine edition . . . . .	281
129. Continuation . . . . .	282
130. GOTHIC VERSION. History of the Silver Codex . . . . .	283
131. Editions . . . . .	284
132. Character of the Silver Codex . . . . .	285
133. Discovery of new fragments of the Gothic version . . . . .	286
134. Language of these documents . . . . .	287
135. Continuation . . . . .	288
136. The country in which they were executed and their antiquity . . . . .	290



	PAGE.
§ 137. Account of the Goths . . . . .	291
138. Ulfilas . . . . .	293
139. Source of the version . . . . .	294
140. Continuation . . . . .	296
141. Character of the version . . . . .	298
142. SCLAVONIC VERSION. Its origin . . . . .	299
143. Its source . . . . .	299
144. Interpolations . . . . .	300
145. Editions . . . . .	301

## CHAPTER IX.

*Principles of Criticism.*

146. Critical apparatus . . . . .	301
147. Principles of criticism . . . . .	303
148. Continuation . . . . .	303
149. Continuation . . . . .	304
150. Continuation . . . . .	305
151. Continuation . . . . .	307

## PART II.

## CHAPTER I.

*Historical books of the N. T.*

1. Order in which the Gospels are arranged . . . . .	309
2. <i>Matthew</i> . Readers for whom, primarily, his Gospel was designed . . . . .	311
3. Object of <i>Matthew's</i> Gospel . . . . .	312
4. Continuation . . . . .	313
5. Time of its composition . . . . .	313
6. Occasion . . . . .	316
7. Continuation . . . . .	317
8. Language in which <i>Matthew</i> composed his book. Testimonies in favor of a Hebrew <i>Matthew</i> . . . . .	318
9. Continuation . . . . .	320
10. Condition of the language of Palestine when <i>Matthew</i> wrote his work . . . . .	326
11. No Hebrew Gospel of <i>Matthew</i> ever existed . . . . .	340
12. <i>Matthew</i> wrote in Greek . . . . .	342
13. <i>Mark</i> . Circumstances of his life . . . . .	344
14. Testimonies respecting the origin of his Gospel . . . . .	345
15. Intended circle of readers. Place of composition . . . . .	347
16. Testimonies respecting the time of its composition . . . . .	348
17. <i>Matthew</i> and <i>Mark</i> . Further investigations concerning their historical sources. Similarity between the two writers . . . . .	349
18. Causes of their agreement. Hypotheses respecting an original Hebrew Gospel . . . . .	352
19. Combination. Marsh's, Eichhorn's, Gratz's hypothesis . . . . .	356

	PAGE.
§ 20. Arguments against the existence of an original Gospel .	358
21. Continuation . . . . .	362
22. Gieseler's hypothesis respecting an original oral Gospel .	364
23. Source of the Gospel of Matthew . . . . .	369
24. Justin's ἀπομνημονεύματα . . . . .	370
25. Relation of the Gospel of Mark to that of Matthew .	375
26. Continuation . . . . .	378
27. Continuation . . . . .	380
28. Continuation . . . . .	382
29. Continuation . . . . .	382
30. Continuation . . . . .	383
31. Continuation . . . . .	384
32. Origin of the Gospel of Mark. Time of its composition .	384
33. <i>Luke.</i> Proem to his Gospel . . . . .	387
34. Circumstances of Luke's life . . . . .	393
35. Theophilus . . . . .	395
36. Relation of Luke's Gospel to those of Matthew and Mark. Coincidence with Matthew . . . . .	396
37. Coincidence with Mark . . . . .	398
38. Attempts at explanation of these facts. Gratz's hy- pothesis. Examination of it . . . . .	401
39. Nature and cause of their variations from each other .	405
40. Agreement of Luke with Mark as to the succession of events . . . . .	407
41. Omissions in the Gospel of Luke . . . . .	410
42. New accounts in the Gospel of Luke . . . . .	411
43. Remarks on the mode of narration in Luke's Gospel .	412
44. Continuation . . . . .	413
45. Continuation . . . . .	414
46. Griesbach's hypothesis respecting the origin of the Gospels. Examination of it . . . . .	415
47. Order of succession of the first three Gospels . . . .	417
48. Continuation . . . . .	418
49. <i>John.</i> Object of his Gospel . . . . .	420
50. Occasion of it . . . . .	421
51. Continuation . . . . .	422
52. Continuation . . . . .	424
53. John was acquainted with the Gospels of Matthew, Mark and Luke . . . . .	425
54. Continuation . . . . .	431
55. Testimonies of ancient writers on this point . . . .	432
56. Plan and nature of John's Gospel . . . . .	433
57. Objections against the Gospel of John. Examina- tion of them . . . . .	433
58. Continuation . . . . .	436
59. Continuation . . . . .	440
60. Continuation . . . . .	441
61. Chronology of the Gospel of John . . . . .	447
62. Harmony of the four Gospels . . . . .	450
63. Value and authority of the four Gospels . . . . .	454

	PAGE.
§ 64. Place for which John's Gospel was destined	455
65. <i>First Epistle of John.</i> Refutation of a position respecting its relation to John's Gospel	456
66. Contents	457
67. Close relation of the Epistle to John's Gospel	458
68. Continuation	459
69. Place of destination	462
70. Continuation	464
71. <i>The second Epistle</i>	465
72. <i>The third Epistle</i>	466
73. Time of the publication of John's Gospel	467
SUPPLEMENT RESPECTING SOME DISPUTED PORTIONS OF THE GOSPELS.	
74. Of the first two chapters of Matthew	469
75. Mark 16: 9, to the end	479
76. John 21: 1, to the end	484
77. <i>Acts of the Apostles.</i> It forms one whole with the Gospel of Luke	488
78. Contents	488
79. Source	489
80. Plan and design of the work	492
81. Continuation	492
82. Chronology of the Acts of the Apostles	493
83. Continuation	499
84. Continuation	501

## CHAPTER II.

*Writings of the apostle Paul.*

85. Circumstances in the life of the apostle	505
86. Continuation	506
87. Character	507
88. Nature of his writings	507
89. Eloquence of the apostle	508
90. The peculiarities of Paul's doctrinal system	510
91. <i>First Epistle to the Thessalonians.</i> Occasion of it	512
92. Place and time of its composition	514
93. Contents	514
94. <i>Second Epistle to the Thessalonians.</i> Occasion of it	514
95. Contents	515
96. <i>Epistle to Titus.</i> Time of Paul's visit to Crete	515
97. Condition of the Christian church at Crete	517
98. Contents of the Epistle	518
99. <i>Epistle to the Galatians</i>	519
100. Inhabitants of Galatia	520
101. Contents of the Epistle	522
102. <i>First Epistle to the Corinthians.</i> Condition of the city. Rise of a Christian church there	522
103. Occasion of the Epistle	523
104. Time of its composition	526

	PAGE.
§105. Contents of the First Epistle to the Corinthians -	528
106. <i>Second Epistle to the Corinthians.</i> Occasion of it -	530
107. Contents -	531
108. Refutation of some objections against it -	532
109. <i>First Epistle to Timothy.</i> Place and time of its composition -	534
110. Continuation -	535
111. Occasion of it -	536
112. Contents -	537
113. Objections of Schleiermacher against the genuineness of the Epistle. Examination of them -	538
114. <i>Epistle to the Romans.</i> Rise of the Christian church in Rome -	541
115. Banishment of Jews and Jewish Christians from Rome -	542
116. Want of harmony between the Jewish and Gentile Christians in Rome -	544
117. Place and time of the composition of the Epistle -	544
118. Object -	546
119. Contents -	547
120. <i>Epistle to the Ephesians.</i> Time and Place of its composition -	548
121. Local destination of the Epistle -	549
122. Contents -	552
123. <i>Epistle to the Colossians.</i> Rise of the Christian church there -	552
124. Time of its composition -	553
125. Contents -	553
126. <i>Of the Epistle to the Laodiceans</i> -	554
127. <i>Epistle to Philemon</i> -	555
128. <i>Second Epistle to Timothy.</i> Time of its composition -	556
129. Continuation -	558
130. Contents -	559
131. Of the heretics against whom the Epistle to the Ephesians, Colossians, and Timothy are aimed -	560
132. Continuation -	564
133. Continuation -	565
134. Remarks on recent attacks upon the two Epistles to Timothy and the Epistle to Titus -	566
135. Continuation -	570
136. Continuation -	571
137. Continuation -	575
138. <i>Epistle to the Philippians.</i> City of Philippi. Reception of the apostle in it -	577
139. Occasion of the Epistle -	577
140. Contents -	578
141. <i>Epistle to the Hebrews.</i> Readers of the Epistle -	578
142. Design -	579
143. Contents -	580
144. Language of the Epistle -	581
145. Author -	583
146. Continuation -	586



	PAGE.
§147. Continuation	589
148. Continuation	599
149. Continuation	600
150. Continuation	601

## CHAPTER III.

*The Catholic Epistles.*

151. Name	603
152. Their authority generally	606
153. <i>Of the second and third Epistles of John.</i> Their genuineness	608
154. Continuation	610
155. <i>Epistle of James.</i> Native land of the author	611
156. Readers of the Epistle	612
157. Occasion of it	613
158. Author	615
159. Continuation	618
160. Literary character of this Epistle	619
161. Genuineness	621
162. Continuation	623
163. Circumstances of the readers	624
164. Time of its composition	626
165. Contents	626
166. Reconciliation of the discrepancy between James and Paul	627
167. <i>First Epistle of Peter.</i> Its resemblance to some of Paul's Epistles	628
168. Its resemblance to the Epistle of James	630
169. Contents	631
170. Design. Time of composition	632
171. Continuation	634
172. Place of composition	635
173. <i>Second Epistle of Peter, and Epistle of Jude.</i> Occasion, object, place of destination	636
174. Contents of the second Epistle of Peter	637
175. Contents of the Epistle of Jude	638
176. Similarity of the two Epistles	638
177. Genuineness of the second Epistle of Peter	640
178. Continuation	641
179. Continuation	643
180. Genuineness of the Epistle of Jude	645
181. Who was Jude?	646
182. Heretics against whom these Epistles were written	647
183. Respecting the citation of apocryphal books in the two Epistles	648
184. <i>The Revelation of John.</i> Place of its composition. Testimonies of the ancients concerning its author	650
185. Contents	662
186. Exposition of it	665
187. Continuation	666
188. Continuation	668
189. Literary character of the book	669

	PAGE.
§190. Time of its composition - - - - -	670
191. Occasion and object - - - - -	672

## NOTES.

1. Style of the New Testament Greek - - - - -	675
2. Evidence in the N. Test. of its genuineness - - - - -	678
3. Manner of quotation by early Christian writers - - - - -	680
4. Nature of the author's argument in favour of the genuineness of the N. Test. books, etc. - - - - -	681
5. Credibility of the New Testament writings - - - - -	682
6. Classification of Manuscripts - - - - -	682
7. Materials of Mss., modes of writing, stichometry, etc. - - - - -	687
8. Versions of the New Testament - - - - -	689
9. Principles of criticism - - - - -	692
10. Explanations inserted by the Evangelists in the text, etc. - - - - -	696
11. References to the fulfilment of Old Testament prophecies in the Gospels - - - - -	697
12. Summaries made by Matthew in his Gospel - - - - -	697
13. Time when the Gospel of Matthew was written - - - - -	698
14. <i>Gospel according to the Hebrews</i> - - - - -	700
15. Original language of Matthew's Gospel - - - - -	704
16. SOURCES of the Gospels of Mark, Luke and Matthew - - - - -	710
17. Gospel of Luke - - - - -	721
18. Gospel of John - - - - -	721
19. Object and plan of John's Gospel - - - - -	725
20. Time and place of composing the Gospel of John, etc. - - - - -	728
21. First Epistle of John - - - - -	730
22. Second Epistle of John - - - - -	733
23. Third Epistle of John - - - - -	734
24. Discrepancy in Genealogies - - - - -	735
25. Visit of the Magi to Bethlehem - - - - -	738
26. Genuineness of several passages - - - - -	738
27. Acts of the Apostles - - - - -	739
28. Epistles to the Thessalonians - - - - -	741
29. Epistle to Titus - - - - -	744
30. Epistle to the Galatians - - - - -	747
31. First Epistle to the Corinthians - - - - -	752
32. Second Epistle to the Corinthians - - - - -	752
33. First Epistle to Timothy - - - - -	753
34. Epistle to the Romans - - - - -	754
35. Epistle to the Ephesians - - - - -	754
36. Epistle to the Colossians - - - - -	758
37. Epistle to Philemon - - - - -	760
38. Second Epistle to Timothy - - - - -	761
39. Epistle to the Philippians - - - - -	763
40. Epistle to the Hebrews - - - - -	763
41. Epistle of James - - - - -	765
42. First Epistle of Peter - - - - -	769
43. Second Epistle of Peter - - - - -	770
44. Epistle of Jude - - - - -	772
45. The Apocalypse - - - - -	774



Ζ ΠΕΡΙ ΤΩΝ ΕΑΡΤΩΝ ΚΑΙ ΤΩΝ ΒΙΧΘΥΩΝ

Μ ΘΥΟΨΗΤΕΙΤΕ  
ΗΔΙΣΕΙΤΕ ΟΤΙ ΕΓΩ

ΚΑΤΗΓΟΡΗΣΩ  
ΜΙΝ ΠΡΟΣ ΤΟΝ ΠΑ

ΕΣΤΙΝ Ο ΚΑΤΗΓΟ

ΡΩΝ ΨΥΧΩΝ ΜΩ

ΥΣΗΣΕΙΣ ΟΝΥΜΕΙΣ

ΗΛΠΗΚΑΤΕ, ΕΙ ΓΑΡ

ΕΠΙΣΤΕΥΕΤΑΙ ΜΩ

ΥΣΕΙ ΕΠΙΣΤΕΥΕΤΕ

ΔΙΕΜΟΙ + ΠΕΡΙ ΓΑΡ

ΕΜΟΥ ΕΚΕΙΝΟ ΣΕ

ΓΡΑΨΕΝ + ΙΔΕΘΙΣ

ΕΚΕΙΝΟΥ ΓΡΑΜΜΑ

ΣΙΝ ΟΥ ΠΙΣΤΕΥΕ

ΤΕ, ΠΩΣ ΤΟΙΣ ΕΜΟΙΣ

ΡΗΜΑΣΙΝ ΠΙΣΤΕΥ

ΣΕΤΕ + ΜΕΤΑ ΤΑΥ

ΤΑ ΠΗΛΑΓΕΝΔΙΣ ΠΕ

ΡΑΝ ΤΗΣ ΘΑΛΑΣ

ΣΗΣ ΤΗΣ ΓΑΛΛΙΑ

ΔΕΣΤΗΣΤΙ ΚΕΡΙΑ

ΔΟΣ, Η ΝΙΚΟΛΟΥΘΕΙ

ΔΕ ΔΥΤΩ Ο ΧΛΟΣ

ΠΟΛΥΣ ΟΤΙ ΕΘΕΩ

ΡΟΥΝΤΑΣ ΗΜΕΙΣ

ΔΕ ΠΟΙΕΙ ΕΠΙ ΤΩ

ΔΕΘΕΝΟΥΝΤΩΝ +

ΑΝΗΛΘΕΝ ΔΕ ΕΙΣ

ΤΟ ΟΡΟΣ ΟΙΣ, ΚΑΙ Ε

ΚΕΙ ΕΚΑΘΗΤΟ ΜΕ

ΤΑ ΤΩΝ ΜΑΘΗ

ΤΩΝ ΑΥΤΟΥ +

ΗΝ ΔΕ ΕΓΓΥΣ ΤΟ

ΠΑΣΧΑΝ ΕΟΡΤΗ ΤΩ

ΙΟΥΔΑΙΩΝ +

ΠΑΡΑΚΟΥΝΤΟΥΣ

ΟΦΘΑΛΜΟΥΣ Ο

ΙΣ, ΚΑΙ ΘΕΑΣΑΜΕ

ΝΟΣ ΟΤΙ ΠΟΛΛΥΣ

Ο ΧΛΟΣ ΕΡΧΕΤΑΙ ΠΡΟΣ

ΑΥΤΟΝ, ΛΕΓΕΙ ΠΡΟΣ

ΦΙΛΙΠΠΟΝ + ΠΟ

ΘΕΝ ΔΙΔΟΡΑΣ ΜΕ

ΑΡΤΟΥΣ + ΙΝΑ ΦΑ

ΓΩΣΙΝ ΟΥΤΟΙ +

ΤΟΥΤΟ ΔΕ ΕΛΕΓΕ

ΠΡΑΞΩΝ ΑΥΤΟ

ΑΥΤΟΣ ΓΑΡ ΗΔΕΙ

ΤΙ ΕΜΕΛΛΕΝ ΠΟΙΕΙ +

Μ 5  
F

Μ 3  
F

Μ Η  
Α Τ

Μ Θ  
Δ

Μ Κ 3 Μ 15 Δ Κ Η



Α' ΕΙΠΕΝ ΟΚΕ. ΟΥΔΕΙΣ

ΤΑΙ ΤΟΝ ΛΟΓΟΝ. ΚΑΙ ΟΥΤΟΙΡΙΖΑΝ  
ΟΥΚ ΕΧΟΥΣΙΝ. ΟΙ ΠΡΟΣΚΑΙΡΟΝ  
ΠΙΣΤΕΥΟΥΣΙΝ. ΚΑΙ ΕΝΙΚΑΙΡΩ  
ΠΕΙΡΑΣΜΟΥ ΑΦΙΣΤΑΝΤΑΙ.

ΤΟ ΔΕ ΕΙΣΤΑΣ ΑΙΚΑΝΘΑΣ ΠΕΣΘΗ  
ΟΥΤΟΙ ΕΙΣΙΝ. ΟΙ ΑΙΚΟΥΣΑΝΤΕΣ,  
ΚΑΙ ΥΠΟ ΜΕΡΙΜΝΩΝ ΚΑΙ ΠΛΟΥΤΟΥ,  
ΚΑΙ ΗΔΟΝΩΝ ΤΟΥ ΒΙΟΥ ΠΟΡΕΥΟ-  
ΜΕΝΟΙ, ΣΥΝ ΠΛΗΓΟΝΤΑΙ ΚΑΙ ΟΥ  
ΤΕΛΕΣΦΟΡΟΥΣΙΝ. ΤΟ ΔΕ ΕΝ

ΤΗ ΚΜΗΓΗ, ΟΥΤΟΙ ΕΙΣΙΝ, ΟΙ ΤΙ  
ΝΕΣ ΕΝ ΚΑΡΔΙΑΙΣ ΑΛΗΘΕΙ ΔΙΑΘΗ,  
ΑΙΚΟΥΣΑΝΤΕΣ ΤΟΝ ΛΟΓΟΝ ΚΑΤΕ-

ΧΟΥΣΙΝ. ΚΑΙ ΚΑΡΠΟΦΟΡΟΥΣΙΝ Ε-  
ΥΠΟΜΟΝΗ. ΠΡ ΤΑΥΤΑ ΛΕΓΕΦΩΝ ΗΙΟΥΕΧ' Ε

ΟΥΔΕΙΣ ΔΕ ΤΑ ΛΥΧΝΟΝ ΑΦΑΣ, ΚΑΙ  
ΠΤΕΙ ΑΥΤΟΝ ΣΙΚΕΥΗ, ΗΥΠΟΙΚΑ-  
ΤΩΙΣ ΛΙΝΗΣ ΤΙΘΗΣΙΝ, ΑΛΛ' ΕΠΙ ΜΥΧΗΙΑΣ ΕΠΙ-  
ΤΙΦΗΣΙΝ

ΠΟΡΕΥΟΜΕΝΟΙ, ΒΛΕΠΩΣΙΝ ΤΟ  
ΦΩΣ. ΟΥΓΑΡ ΕΣΤΙΝ ΙΓΡΥΗ ΤΟ

ΟΥΦΑΝΕΡΟΝ ΠΕΝΗΣΕΤΑΙ.  
ΟΥΔΕ ΑΠΟΚΡΥΦΟΝ, Ο ΟΥΓΗΩΣ  
ΘΗΣΕΤΑΙ. ΚΑΙ ΕΙΣΦΑΝΕΡΟΝ ΕΛ-  
ΘΗ. ΒΛΕΠΕΤΕ ΟΥΝ, ΠΩΣ ΑΙΚΟΥΕΤΕ.

04  
π

ω  
1

0  
ΛΒ  
7Β

0  
1.0  
μ











THE MASTER'S COLLEGE



3 3540 00029 1500